The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXI, No. 5 November, 1944

CONTENTS

Reinhold Niebuhr and the Catholic Church (I)
Edmond Darvil Benard 321
Emotion in the Gospels .... *James A. Kleist, S.J.* 330
Peace in Prayer .... *Thomas Owen Martin* 342
Catholics on the Police Force .... *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 349
The Audience Factor in Preaching .... *Luke Missett, C.P.* 358
Papal Documents of 1942 .... *Jerome D. Hannan* 367
An Effective Demonstration from the Marks of the Church
Joseph Clifford Fenton 380

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Mass in a Fishing Cabin 391
Reconsecration of Altar Stones 391
The Three Masses on Christmas Day 392
The Pax for the First Master of Ceremonies 392
The Confessor of Religious 393
The Eucharistic Fast 394
Lip-Stick as a Theological Problem 395

Contents Continued on Next Page

Published monthly by The Board of Trustees of The American Ecclesiastical Review, from Mt. Royal and Guilford Aves., Baltimore 2, Md. Subscription price, U. S. currency or equivalent: United States and Canada, $4.00—Foreign Postage, $1.00 additional. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, January 10, 1944, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, Mt. Royal and Guilford Aves., Baltimore 2, Maryland or to The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1944, by The American Ecclesiastical Review

Contents continued from previous page

BOOK REVIEWS

The Ascetical Life . . . . *by Pascal P. Parente* 396

Poland and Russia: The Last Quarter Century *by Ann Su Cardwell* 397

Western Civilization. The Decline of Rome to 1600 *by Francis J. Tschan and others* 398

BOOK NOTES 400

A *Valuable* Compendium for Every Priest

"*Instructions* of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments on the Rules to be Followed by the Pastor in Making the Canonical Inquiries before He Permits the *Marriage Couple* to Enter *Matrimony*."

A complete and detailed exposition of Canon 1020 together with Appendix Giving Questionnaires of the Instructions.

Fifteen cents per copy

The American Ecclesiastical Review
The Catholic University of America
Washington 17, D. C.

REINHOLD NIEBUHR AND THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

PART ONE

In the spring and autumn of 1939, Professor Reinhold Niebuhr of the Union Theological Seminary delivered the Gifford Lectures in "natural theology" at the University of Edinburgh. For an American to be invited to fill the post of Gifford lecturer is accounted a signal honor. Dr. Niebuhr was only the fifth American to receive that distinction in the fifty-four years in which the lectures have been given. His discourses were later published in two volumes, with the general title *The Nature and Destiny of Man.* Volume I deals with "Human Nature" and Volume II, with "Human Destiny."[1]

The critical reaction to Dr. Niebuhr's books was decidedly on the favorable side. "In these Gifford Lectures," wrote Bernard Iddings Bell in his *New York Times* review of Volume I, "Dr. Niebuhr takes his place as the outstanding moral theologian among Protestants of today."[2] The appearance of Volume I inspired *Time* magazine to term Dr. Niebuhr "America's most influential theologian."[3] In *Ethics*, Ordway Tead remarked of Volume II: "This extraordinary book is not easy to review. It has an amazing wealth of scholarly lore, a richness of insight and perceptiveness, an architectural quality of rearing before one's eyes a structure of impressive logical design—all of which may well entitle it to the distinction of being (with its preceding Volume I) the most notable Christian apologia of our times in the English language."[4]

It should hardly be without interest to Catholics, and particularly to Catholic priests, to whom is entrusted the spiritual guidance of their people, that "the most notable Christian apologia of our times in the English language," written by "the outstanding moral theologian among Protestants today," launches a direct and vigorous attack against the Catholic Church.

Reinhold Niebuhr enjoys a considerable reputation as a scholar and as an original thinker. He is, moreover, a clever writer, a capable rhetorician, and a persuasive advocate. We do not believe that his attack against Catholicism is a malicious one, nor do we question his sincerity. We do believe, however, that his criticisms of the Catholic Church are based upon a misunderstanding of its teachings, an inadequate view of history, and not a little intellectual confusion.

---

[1] *The Nature and Destiny of Man: I, Human Nature; II, Human Destiny* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943).

[2] *New York Times* book review section, April 6, 1941, p. 14.

[3] *Time*, XXXVII, 38 (March 24, 1941), 38.

[4] *Ethics*, LIV (1944), 150 f.

The Nature and Destiny of Man was obviously not written expressly *in order* to assail the Catholic Church. Dr. Niebuhr believes that "there are resources in the Christian faith for an understanding of human nature which have been lost in modern culture,"[5] and the essential aim of his work is to develop his own notion of what those resources are. But his interpretation of Christianity, which is, to a certain extent, original, on many points runs directly counter to the teachings of Catholicism. If the Catholic Church is right, Dr. Niebuhr, no matter how sincere he may be, is wrong. He must, therefore, logically and inevitably, attack the Catholic Church; for if his version of the Christian faith is to gain credence, the Catholic Church must be discredited as the custodian of the teachings of Jesus Christ.

It is the purpose of our study to consider briefly some salient features of Dr. Niebuhr's notion of Christianity, and to examine the principal items in the case which he makes out against the doctrines of the Catholic Church. His major objections to Catholicism are, it would seem, the temerity of the Church in claiming to teach absolute truth (which results in an "intolerance" which Dr. Niebuhr abhors), and the importance of the element of "natural law" in the Church's moral code. We shall examine these criticisms in detail in two succeeding articles. The present paper is intended to serve as a general introduction to Dr. Niebuhr's theological ideas and method, as exemplified in *The Nature and Destiny of Man*.

It goes without saying that it would be impossible, in the space of these three articles, to attempt to answer every incidental remark which Dr. Niebuhr takes occasion to make to the detriment of Catholicism. He makes such accusations easily, blandly, without a single reference to any authority, without a shred of factual evidence introduced to support them. He asserts, for instance, in connection with "the triumph of the Renaissance," that "The Catholic form of the [Christian] religion became discredited by the fact that *all the liberties of modern life* and *all the achievements of social and political justice* were established in defiance of Catholicism's premature identification of its feudal society with the sanctities of the Kingdom of God."[6] We have searched Dr. Niebuhr's volumes for some justification of such a universal, sweeping condemnation; and we have searched in vain. The fact is, of course, that in the light of history such a statement is simply ridiculous. From her very beginnings, the Church has insisted on the dignity of the individual human being as a person endowed with an immortal soul, which is surely the first principle of all liberty, and of any "achievements of social and political justice." She has been a bulwark against political tyranny, as even Dr. Niebuhr himself elsewhere admits.[7] She has not ceased down to our own day in her efforts to achieve social justice among men; (we assume that Dr. Niebuhr is familiar at least with *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno*). But we cannot here repeat the history of the Catholic Church. We can only refer Dr. Niebuhr to a more careful reading of it

---

[5] Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, I, vii.

It is equally impossible to call attention to every factual error of which Dr. Niebuhr is guilty. He states, for example, that the title "Vicar of Christ" as applied to the Roman Pontiff, dates only from Innocent III.[8] (Here again, he refuses to pamper his readers by referring them to any authority.) But it is a matter of historical record that the title "Vicar of Christ" was applied to the Pope at least *seven centuries* before the date favored by Dr. Niebuhr.[9] In his preface to Volume II, Professor Niebuhr admits that he has "naturally exceeded" his "scholarly competence in many fields of inquiry," and that "critics will no doubt be able to point to many errors in detail."[10]

---

[6] *Ibid.*, II, 183. (Italics ours.) Dr. Niebuhr does concede, however, that Catholicism still boasts a "vestigial vitality."

[7] "The fact that the papal-ecclesiastical power actually achieved a measure of impartiality and transcendence over warring nations and competing social forces and was thereby enabled to play a creative rôle in the history of the Western world may be recorded with gratitude" (*ibid.*, II, 145). "Despite its own corruption of fanaticism, the Catholic version of the Christian faith is at least a bulwark against the idolatry of political and national absolutisms" (*ibid.*, p. 241).

How these two statements can be reconciled with Dr. Niebuhr's assertion that "all the liberties of modern life and all the achievements of social and political justice were established in defiance of Catholicism's premature identification of its feudal society with the sanctities of the Kingdom of God," we have not the faintest idea.

[8] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 144 n.

[9] "We regard you as the Vicar of Christ," was a synodal acclamation given to Pope Gelasius I in Rome, March 13, 495. Those interested in the exact meaning of the title and the historical evidence concerning it may consult the article "Vicarius Christi," by the Rev. Dr. Joseph Clifford Fenton in *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, CX, 6 (June, 1944), 459-70.

[10] Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, II, vi.

Now this is a genial and disarming concession; mere "errors in detail" seem harmless enough. But such an admission is no excuse for the employment of a wildly erroneous statement of fact in support of an assertion that the title "Vicar of Christ" in connection with the Pope "appears blasphemous from the perspective of a prophetic view of history."[11] This is an error in detail of which Dr. Niebuhr has no right, in simple justice, to be guilty.

We might mention, also, that for an author who can write so eloquently, Dr. Niebuhr is at times extremely loose in his use of words and his application of labels. "The official Catholic doctrine of original sin," he writes, "usually regarded as 'Semi-Pelagian' . . ."[12] Usually regarded? By whom? By the Second Council of Orange, which, in the year 529, condemned Semi-Pelagianism as a heresy against the Catholic faith, perhaps?

DR. NIEBUHR'S IDEA OF CHRISTIANITY

Since we have no intention of giving a complete summary of Dr. Niebuhr's volumes, we do not claim that this first section of our study is a comprehensive picture of his theory of Christianity. We do hope to indicate the theoretical bases for the criticisms of Catholicism which we shall treat later, and to mention some of the major difficulties which we find in Dr. Niebuhr's work.

As nearly as we can judge, Professor Niebuhr's system (if we may call it that) is based upon a psychological concept and an epistemological principle. While he appeals to the Old and New Testaments, secular and ecclesiastical history, and Catholic and Protestant theologians, all these rather occupy the position of a supporting company. And they do not always seem particularly well cast.

The capacity of the human ego for self-transcendence is the psychological concept which is of major importance. It is an idea which recurs constantly in both volumes of *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, and while it is not, of course, original with Dr. Niebuhr, there is, so far as we know, no other work in which its importance is so eloquently and forcefully brought home to the reader.

Man, Professor Niebuhr points out, not only has a centre, but a centre beyond himself.[13] "Man is the only animal which can make itself its own object,"[14] and thus the human spirit "has the special capacity of standing continually outside itself in terms of indefinite regression."[15] This power of self-transcendence is the basis of genuine individuality and of human freedom.[16] It is also the reason for the "essential homelessness" of the human spirit, because "the self which stands outside itself and the world cannot find the meaning of life in itself or the world."[17] For much of his explanation of self-transcendence, Dr. Niebuhr, as Fathers Ryan and Bluett have remarked, is in substantial accord with the Scholastic treatment of "perfect reflection,"[18] and *The Nature and Destiny of Man* is, in this respect, a treasury of penetrating and valuable insights.

---

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 144.

[12] *Ibid.*, I, 247.

[13] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 55.

[14] *Ibid.*

If Professor Niebuhr's basic psychological concept is fundamentally sound (and we believe it is), the same cannot be said for his epistemology. He stresses the futility of relying on reason for an unchangeable norm of conduct, and he has nothing but scorn for any individual or any institution claiming the possession of absolute truth. "All human knowledge is tainted with an 'ideological' taint. It pretends to be more true than it is. It is finite knowledge, gained from a particular perspective; but it pretends to be final and ultimate knowledge."[19] To claim possession of absolute truth is a sin of intellectual pride.[20] From intellectual pride it is an easy step to "moral pride," which is revealed "in all 'self-righteous' judgments in which the other is condemned because he fails to conform to the highly arbitrary standards of the self."[21] When moral pride is made explicit, we have the "ultimate sin"— the sin of explicitly relating our partial standards and relative attainments to the unconditioned good, and of claiming for them divine sanction.[22]

It is on this epistemological basis that Dr. Niebuhr rejects what he calls "Catholic natural law" and flatly accuses the Catholic Church of the "ultimate sin."

When we come to what we might call the properly "theological" part of Dr. Niebuhr's idea of Christianity, we must admit that it appears to us to be involved in considerable confusion. Modern Protestant theology as a whole is far from clear, even, apparently, to those who write it; and Professor Niebuhr's *The Nature and Destiny of Man* does not seem to be as much of an exception to this rule as one might wish.

---

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

[16] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 55.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[18] Cf. E. A. Ryan, S.J., and J. Bluett, S.J., article, "The Nature and Destiny of Man," in *Theological Studies*, V, 1 (March, 1944), 78. This article is a careful summary of Dr. Niebuhr's work.

[19] Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, I, 194.

[20] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 195 ff.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 199.

[22] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 200.

As conceived in Catholic seminaries and universities, theology is a science. It is a science which demands a thorough preliminary discipline in the logic and metaphysics of the *philosophia perennis*. Catholic theology does not make distinctions for the sheer joy of it. Its distinctions have been clarified and its definitions formulated over the course of centuries of discussion and controversy among the great theologians of the Schools. Catholic theology is a rational discipline, based upon the data of faith, that has only one object, the presentation of the teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ in the manner most truly expressive of the exact sense of that teaching.

With all the best intentions in the world, then, it is hard to be patient when one comes in contact with a work which blithely dismisses the teachings of Catholic theology without giving much indication that those teachings have been really understood.

To proceed to some of the specific difficulties which we find with Professor Niebuhr's theology: we might remark, first of all, that if *The Nature and Destiny of Man* deserves to be called "the most notable Christian apologia of our times in the English language," it would appear that it should contain a definite answer at least to the basic, absolutely fundamental question: is Jesus Christ really God or is He not?

We have read and re-read Dr. Niebuhr's volumes as carefully as we know how, with a special and repeated examination of those passages which one would presume, *a priori*, to be pertinent to the question. And we must admit that we do not know whether or not Professor Niebuhr believes that Christ is God.

To be sure, "in the life, death and resurrection of Christ, the expected disclosure of God's sovereignty over history, and the expected establishment of that sovereignty had taken place."[23] (This is, incidentally, one of the very few references Dr. Niebuhr makes to the resurrection. Nowhere does he attach any importance to it in connection with the divinity of Christ.) There is certainly a "revelation of God in Christ."[24] Professor Niebuhr also refers to "the same Christ who is accepted by faith as the revelation of the character of God."[25] These affirmations might mean anything, or, taking into account the ambiguity of modern Protestant terminology with regard to the divinity of Christ, they might very well mean nothing.

---

[23] *Ibid.*, II, 35.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 69.

When we came to Dr. Niebuhr's affirmation that "The justice and the forgiveness of God are one, just as Father and Son are equally God,"[26] we thought, in our simplicity, that the question had been resolved in the affirmative: that Dr. Niebuhr did believe that Jesus Christ is God. But we were to be disillusioned. Note what Dr. Niebuhr has to say on the "sinlessness" of Christ:

> The more moralistic liberal Protestant interpretations of the sinlessness of Christ are probably most perfectly expressed in Schleiermacher's conception of the perfection of Christ's "God-consciousness." But Schleiermacher is forced by his conception into a very unscriptural denial that Christ was "in all points tempted like as we are" yet without sin. Schleiermacher is quite right of course in suggesting that to be tempted means in a sense to have sinned; for temptation is a state of anxiety from which sin flows inevitably. And this anxiety is a concomitant of finite and insecure existence. It is not possible for this reason to assert the sinlessness of every individual act of any actually historical character. It is possible to assert that in Jesus there is a remarkable coincidence and consistency of doctrine, of purpose and of act.[27]

Perhaps we are being naively literal, but Professor Niebuhr seems to hold that, since Christ is indubitably an "actually historical character," it is not possible to assert the sinlessness of His every individual act. Now sin, even after Dr. Niebuhr has explained its nature, is still a moral evil. Can God commit evil? Can God sin?

There is another difficulty in crediting Dr. Niebuhr with a belief that Christ is God. Regarding the "second coming," he writes:

> One seemingly serious, but actually superficial, change in Jesus' own interpretation must be made. He expected the historic interim between the first and second establishment of the Kingdom to be short. In this error he was followed both by St. Paul and the early church, with the consequent false and disappointed hope of the *parousia* in the lifetime of the early disciples.[28]

[25] *Ibid.*, I, 146.
[26] *Ibid.*, II, 56.
[27] *Ibid.*, p. 73.
[28] *Ibid.*, pp. 49 f.

Can an omniscient God be guilty of error? Could Jesus Christ, if He is God, have, through His mistaken opinion, led into false hope and disappointment His own disciples?

We might add, in all good humor, that the Catholic Church, with all her "moral pride," has never yet taken it upon herself to correct an "error" of Jesus Christ.

It is perhaps to be expected that Dr. Niebuhr would regard any attempt to affirm speculatively the fact that Christ had a divine and human nature as verging on "logical nonsense."[29] But his rejection would be more convincing if he gave some indication that he understood just what Catholic theology is talking about when it uses the metaphysical concepts of "nature" and "person."

All in all, the treatment of the divinity of Christ in *The Nature and Destiny of Man* is a very puzzling performance. We hope that we are not doing Dr. Niebuhr an injustice, but really, the most definite thing we can say is this: perhaps Dr. Niebuhr is willing to believe that Christ is God if Christ is willing to be God on Dr. Niebuhr's terms.

In addition to the uncertainty regarding the divinity of Christ, Professor Niebuhr's work is not entirely free from other faults of modern Protestant theological writing. He has no hesitancy in rejecting the literal meaning of Scriptural texts in favor of a highly personal exegesis. He has, for instance, little patience with those guilty of the "literalistic error" of regarding the Fall of man as an historical event.[30] In accordance with what he believes to be a legitimate development from his concept of the self-transcendent self, he prefers to regard the state of "perfection before the Fall," as "perfection before the act,"[31]—that is, before the act of any given human being at any given time.

Dr. Niebuhr does not care too much for theological distinctions (at least for those other than his own). This is a pity; for the lack of a clear concept of the distinctions between the natural and supernatural orders, between the theological virtues and the state of "original justice," and especially between actual and original sin, leads him into developments which, while beautifully written and evidently inspired by high moral ideals, are theologically almost fantastic.[32]

We believe that we have given enough concerning Dr. Niebuhr's theological ideas so that the reader will be able to appreciate the background of the major charges against Catholicism which we shall consider in future issues of *The American Ecclesiastical Review.* We have only one final remark. We do wish that Dr. Niebuhr had not retained some of the classical terminology of Catholic theology for use in a sense utterly alien to its true meaning. He was, perhaps, interested in maintaining some semblance of continuity between the traditional teachings of Christianity and his own. But words are not entirely the servants of a writer, to use as he wishes; they have a signification proper to themselves. There are, unfortunately, many times, when reading *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, when it is difficult not to be reminded of a passage from *Through the Looking Glass:* " 'When *I* use a word,' Humpty Dumpty said in a rather scornful tone, 'it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less.' 'The question is,' said Alice, 'whether you *can* make words mean so many different things.' 'The question is,' said Humpty Dumpty, "Which is to be master—that's all.' "

---

[29] Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 61.

[30] Cf. *ibid.*, I, 267 ff.

[31] Cf. ibid., p. 278.

[32] Cf. for example, *ibid.*, Chapter X, "Justitia Originalis."

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

EDMOND DARVIL BENARD.

EMOTION IN THE GOSPELS

Westerners are undemonstrative people. As a class, they dislike making a public show of their feelings. When I am at the typewriter, I imagine a ghost at my elbow, the ghost of "respectability," raising his finger and saying: "You must not let your emotion run away with you. It may be genuine, but you must not 'wear it on your lip and brow.' " This general aversion to letting oneself go in public may prove a serious handicap in translating the Gospels into modern English. The men who wrote the New Testament were Orientals, and Orientals are comparatively frank in telling the world how they feel. What, then, is the translator to do? His first duty is to realize how much emotion there is in the Gospel narratives; his second, to muster courage and try to measure up to the originals by suitable expressions. The Gospels were not written in the dispassionate style of distant observers or of unimpressed narrators. Some of them had witnessed the great spiritual movement which they describe; others tell what reliable eye-witnesses had related. The participants in that drama were real actors, not mere puppets.

Before discussing emotion in the Gospels, however, I wish to say a word about emotion as a feature of the liturgy, partly by way of contrast, and partly in confirmation of what I am recommending in this essay. In the Missal we are in an atmosphere charged with high tension. The Kyrie re-echoes the impetuous cry of the blind men in the Gospels: "Jesus, son of David, take pity on us!" The Gloria is an enthusiastic praise, of considerable length, of the Blessed Trinity: "Laudamus te! Benedicimus te! Adoramus te! Glorificamus te! Gratias agimus tibi propter magnam gloriam tuam!" No wonder it ends on a note of ecstasy: "Tu solus Sanctus! Tu solus Dominus! Tu solus Altissimus!" The Preface is a lyrical outburst, ending in the rapturous "Sanctus!" In the parts of the Mass more directly concerned with the tremendous mystery, the Church dampens her show of feeling; yet even the "little elevation" (Per ipsum . . . omnis honor et gloria") is really a fervent ejaculation. Certain Masses, moreover, call for special expressions of fervor. Thus the "Lauda, Sion, Salvatorem" is the Church's tribute to the Eucharistic Christ "in hymnis et canticis." In the "Exsultet iam angelica" she makes jubilee to her newly-risen Light.[1] Many of the Introits, too, are bursts of emotion, as that for the Epiphany, "Ecce, advenit Dominator Dominus!" or that for Easter, "Resurrexi, et adhuc tecum sum!" or that for All Saints, "Gaudeamus omnes in Domino, diem festum celebrantes!"

But the inexhaustible reservoir of emotion in the Missal is the Psalter. The Jews were a passionate race, and David, as we know him from the psalms, was a Jew of the Jews. He hardly ever dwells, in the epic style, on a quiet recital of the *magnalia Dei.* It is more to his taste to throw out ejaculations, occasioned by some happy or some untoward accident in his checkered career.[2] He rushes from one emotion to another; he can praise God and damn His enemies in the same breath. Simple statements he intersperses with lively dialogue, and so great is his rush that his commentators often find it difficult to keep pace with his thought. The two psalms in the Missal, 42 (*Judica me*) and 25 (*Lavabo*), are no exception to the rule.[3]

What has all this to do with "emotion in the Gospels?" It shows convincingly that the Church, in her *official* capacity, is not ashamed to give wings to her feelings. No matter what our national character may be, whether we are Orientals or Westerners, Northerners or Southerners, if we follow the Roman rite we all are caught up by the whirl of emotion. Consequently, if the official language of the Church in her liturgy is steeped in emotion, how can it be a "debasement" of the Word of God in the Gospels when these, too, are presented with all the trimmings of the original?

The question, then, is this: are individual translators justified in following their personal bent for restrained expression and stripping the Gospel narratives of what they consider mere frills or even excresences, or should they, rather, follow the example of the Church set in her liturgy and do full justice to the spirit-stirring originals? The question is not an easy one to decide; for, it may be argued, some allowance should be made for the character of the nation into whose language the Gospels are translated. Speaking generally, the latter method of rendering gives us more intimate glimpses of what was really going on in Palestine at the time of Christ; and that, surely, is an advantage. If the crowds "when they heard this, *were enthusiastic* about His teaching" (Matt. 23:33), why should one hesitate to say so in a modern translation?[4] Or, when Elizabeth, "inspired by the Holy Spirit, *exclaimed in a ringing voice:* 'Oh, *how privileged I am* to have the mother of my Lord come to visit me!" (Luke 1:42–43), can anyone prefer the old tame rendering, "*Whence is this to me* that the mother of my Lord should come unto me?" a rendering dictated, no doubt, by an excessive reverence for the *words*, the *littera*, of the Vulgate; but then, "the letter kills, the spirit gives life." A spiritless rendering of a lively Gospel text is like a flat roof on a Gothic church.

---

[1] *Exsultet:* lit. "*dance* with joy." Cf. *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* CIX 6 (December, 1943), "Towards a Translation of the Roman Missal."

[2] As, "omnes gentes, *plaudite manibus, jubilate* Deo in voce *exsultationis*" (Ps. 46).

[3] In my pamphlet, *The Great Prayer Now—In Time of War* (St. Louis, Mo.: The Queen's Work, 1943), I ventured (*heu me miserum!*) to give a somewhat spirited rendering. For the tone of the original Hebrew, cf. Vander Heeren, *Psalmi et Cantica* (Brugis: Beyaert, 1924).

Outside the Gospels, the New Testament writers are intent upon explaining the Christian mode of life to an audience grown up in paganism. Yet in the midst of an intellectual battle with the enemies of the new faith, St. Paul is at times stirred to a fervent expression of his ardent love of Christ, or to a jubilant realization of the treasures found in Him, or to a sense of the utter helplessness of unregenerate nature.

> If any man does not love the Lord Jesus Christ,
> let him be anathema!
> (1 Cor. 16:22)
>
> What can part us from Christ's love?[5]
> Distress? Or anguish of soul?
> Or persecution? or hunger?
> Or nakedness? Or danger? Or the sword?
> (Rom. 8:35)
>
> O the profundity of the riches
> of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God!
> How incomprehensible are His judgments!
> How unsearchable His ways!
> (Rom. 11:33)
>
> Unhappy man that I am!
> Who will deliver me from this sinful body?[6]
> The grace of God through Jesus Christ our Lord!
> (Rom. 7:24)

---

[4] Cf. my *The Gospel of St. Mark* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1937), p. 165.

[5] The rendering of this line is from Moffatt's well known Translation (New York: Doran, 1922). "Christ's love" is, of course, Christ's love for us. Cf. Cornely. "What" seems preferable to the more literal "Who" because of the following impersonal nouns.

[6] "This sinful body," for: "the body of this death," or, "this body of death." Cf. Cornely.

Utterances such as these rank with the best in the liturgy. Their emotional effect on the reader may be heightened by colometrization—that is, presentation *per cola et commata* (as St. Jerome says),[7] or, as we should say, in sense lines or sense units. This outward form attunes the reader to the emotional content.

Turning now to the Gospels, I wish to call attention to three varieties of emotion.

The *first group* contains illustrations of what the Greeks would call πάθος,[8] that deep-seated passion which finds expression in a lively form, as in the cry wrung from Christ's agonized Heart on the cross:

> My God, my God, why dost Thou abandon me!

Note that the present tense in English, representing the Greek "dramatic aorist," brings out the pathos better than the customary "hast Thou abandoned me."

The "callousness" of the disciples more than once forced a complaint from our Lord:

> O unbelieving generation!
> How long must I be with you!
> How long must I bear with you!
> (Mark 9:18)

> On the last and solemn day of the feast of Tabernacles,
> Jesus *stood erect and cried out:*
> If anyone thirsts,
> let him come to follow me
> and drink!
> (John 7:37)

Here, too belong the *Woe's* hurled at the infidel leaders of the Jewish people:

> Perdition awaits you, scribes and Pharisees,
> hypocrites that you are!
> You shut the Kingdom of Heaven in men's faces,
> for, besides not going in yourselves,
> you block the way of those who try to go in!

---

[7] For a discussion of the ancient "Colometry," Cf. my *The Gospel of St. Mark*, pp. 89–130.

[8] For the distinction between πάθος and ἦθος, cf. *The Rhetoric of Aristotle*, by Lane Cooper (New York: Appleton, 1932), *passim*. Cf. page 337 of this essay.

Perdition awaits you, scribes and Pharisees,
hypocrites that you are!
You scour land and sea to make one convert,
and, when you succeed,
you make him an incarnate devil
twice as bad as yourselves!
(Matt. 23:13–15)

The *second group* of emotional passages would be classified by the Greeks as illustrations of *ἦθος*, that subtle something which charms the reader and awakens his gentler feelings, instead of ploughing up his soul. The following selection from Isaias shows great artistry in addition to depth of feeling:

Behold my Servant, whom I have chosen,
My Only One, in whom my soul delights!
My Spirit will I repose on Him,
and to the nations will He proclaim
the rightful order of things.
He will not wrangle, or rend the air,
nor will His voice be heard
in the thoroughfare.
The broken reed He will not crush,
or quench the smouldering wick,
till He has pushed the righteous cause
onward to victory.
His name will be the hope of the nations.
(Matt. 12:18–21)

It certainly does our heart good to see so much *benignitas et humanitas* envisioned by the old Prophet centuries before our Lord appeared on earth.

And who can resist the charm of our Lord's invitation to come to Him, uttered on that memorable occasion when the disciples returned from their first missionary tour:

Oh, come to me,
all you who are weary and oppressed,
and I will refresh you!

Take my yoke upon you,
and master my lessons,
for I am gentle and humble of heart,
and you will find rest for the weary soul.
My yoke is mild and my burden light.
(Matt. 11:28–30)

One of the most touching specimens of the second group is our Lord's prayer addressed to His heavenly Father on the same occasion, when His Heart was stirred to thank Him for His way of dealing with mankind:

Inspired by the occasion, Jesus said:[9]
    I praise Thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth,
    for Thou hidest these things
        from wise and prudent men,
    and revealest them to little ones!
    Yes, Father—for such is Thy good pleasure!
                                        (Matt. 11:25–26)

To think that not all the world accepted His teaching! Note the tinge of sadness and resignation in the last words. To great masses of people our Lord was a stumbling block; but He submits to the Father's "good pleasure." Old Simeon had already given us a glimpse into the recesses of God's predilection:

Alas! This Babe is destined
    to be a cause of downfall
    no less than of rising[10]
    for multitudes of Israel,
and to be a Symbol of contradiction,
    so that the secret thoughts of many a heart
    shall be laid bare.
                                        (Luke 2:34–35)

And had not Jesus Himself declared, on another solemn occasion:

To be the Parting of the Way—
that is why I have come into the world:
henceforth the sightless are to have sight,
and those who see are to become blind.
                                        (John 9:39)

This selection brings us to John, the beloved disciple, to whom it was given to reveal the Lord's inmost thoughts entertained by Him on the eve of His passion when the shadows of Calvary were closing in upon Him. The chapters 14 to 17 must be read and pondered as the most exquisite illustration of what I have called the ἦθος of the Gospels. For lack of space I can quote only a few lines from Chapter 17:

---

[9] The rendering "at that time" misses the connotations both of καιρόs and of ἐκεῖνος. Cf. the standard commentaries, esp. Th. Zahn.

[10] "No less than" is an instance of Parataxis, for which cf. my *The Gospel of St. Mark*, p. 137.

> Holy Father!
> Keep them loyal to Thy Name
> which Thou hast given me to reveal,
> that they may be one as we are One!
>
> As long as I was with them,
> I kept them loyal to Thy Name
> which Thou hast given me to reveal.
> Yes, I have shielded and sheltered them,
> and not one of them is lost except the man
> whose loss is his own wilful deed.
>
> Just Father!
> The world does not know Thee;
> but I know Thee,
> and so, too, these men know
> that I am Thy Ambassador!
>
> May the love with which Thou lovest me
> make its abode in them,
> even as I make my abode in them myself!
> (John 17:11-12; 25-26)

As may be seen from the selections given above, I would recommend: (1) colometrization as a fitting garb for emotional expressions, and (2) a generous use of the exclamation mark to help the reader to sense the presence of emphasis in the original. St. Jerome tells us that in his time the teachers of Latin and Greek employed writing *per cola et commata* in expounding Cicero and Demosthenes. It was this fact that induced him to employ colometry in his own rendering of the Bible.

While examples of downright passion or πάθος in the Gospels are comparatively few in number, that more subdued and mellower kind of emotion called ἦθος is, one may say, one of the most striking characteristics of these narratives. There is something irresistible, for example, in the charm that invests the story of our Lord's infancy in the two opening chapters of St. Luke. Inimitably beautiful, too, is Christ's sudden appearance to Mary Magdalene on the morning of the Resurrection in the garden close by Mount Calvary. The best proofs, however, of this pervading ἦθος in the Gospels are the scenes which directly tell of the impression our Lord made on His audience. Take, for instance, that blessing bestowed on Him by an emotional Jewish mother (Luke 11:27): "Blessed the womb that has borne you! Blessed the breasts that have suckled you!" When Jesus told his fellow citizens at Nazareth that "today this text of Scripture is fulfilled in what you now hear me say" (Luke 4:21), the Evangelist adds that "everyone spoke highly of Him and *was charmed by the winning words* that fell from His lips." When hardy soldiers sent to arrest Jesus returned without Him, they excused their failure to seize Him by saying (John 6:46): "Never has man spoken as this man speaks!" Aristotle, in his *Rhetoric* (II, I), explains this ἦθος as consisting of three qualities in the speaker, which are sure to win assent to what he says: φρόνησις, ἀρετή, and εὔνοια,—"intelligence, virtue, and good will toward the audience." Elsewhere he makes bold to say that this ἦθος (that is, the character of the speaker) is of all the means of persuasion "the most potent." None of us will deny that our Lord must have possessed these qualities in the most eminent degree. No wonder that distinct traces of it have found their way into the story of His life and teachings. The crowds were attracted by His personality:

> My heart goes out to the multitude: for full three days they have been staying with me and have nothing left to eat.
>
> (Matt. 15:32)

In the *third group* we may place those stylistic devices which the Evangelists employed to enliven their narrative. Where there is life, there is a current of pleasant or unpleasant emotion. In the use of devices, the task of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John—everyone of them a *homo de plebe*—was easy, for since these modes of speech were inherent in our Lord's own popular form of teaching, they had only to report faithfully what He said and how He said it, and the result was *ipso facto* full of life. Under this heading belongs the frequent use of rhetorical questions or exclamations, as in Matt. 5:13: "Suppose salt should ever go flat: *by what means can its nature be restored?*" Of course, no answer was expected from the audience. Then there is the almost universal use of *oratio recta* or direct discourse in the reports of messengers, as in Matt. 11:2–6. Then, again, there is our Lord's constant habit of keeping in touch with His audience and, as it were, taking it into His confidence, as in Luke 14:5: "Suppose a son or an ox of *some one of you* falls into a well . . ."; or in Matt. 11:16: "*Where can*

I find something to characterize this generation? It reminds me of little children. . . ." Finally, there is the use of parables, those intimate touches of life, which have a strongly dramatic appeal: "*Look! A sower goes out* to sow!" All these modes of haranguing great crowds were characteristic of the rabbinical teaching of the time, and a translator need but render "literally" to catch the emotional tone. However, the specimen just quoted shows how he may even enhance the effect intended by using the lively present tense for the Greek empiric aorist.

Besides these stylistic devices, there are three words which more than others infuse "life" into the Gospel narrative. The first is εὐθύς, "at once, straightway, immediately, without delay." This occurs 41 times in the Gospel of St. Mark alone! As he saw it, things were in a perpetual rush, and, of course, where there is rush, there is life.

The second word expressive of high emotion is ἐκπλήττομαι (with its synonymns: θαυμάζω, ἐξίσταμαι, and ἔκστασις. This has suffered badly at the hands of translators. Let them remember that ἐκπλήττομαι is one of the stock expressions for "falling in love at first sight."[11]

> It was only on the third day that they discovered Him in a Temple hall, seated among the Rabbis, now listening to them, now asking them questions, while all those who heard Him *were charmed* by His intelligence and His answers. They *were overjoyed* at seeing Him.
>
> (Luke 2:46–48)

> He then charged the people not to tell anyone; but the more *strictly* He charged them, the more freely, for their part, they published the fact. Indeed, the people went beyond all bounds in *expressing their delight:* "Everything He has done is *wonderful*! He gives hearing to the deaf and speech to the speechless!"
>
> (Mark 7:35–37)

Finally, there is that bugbear of modern translators, the particle ἰδού. They do not seem to know what to make of it. In some contexts a simple "see" or "look" or "observe" will answer the purpose. "Behold" is at present tending to drop out of everyday speech and has, therefore, no place in modern rendering. This particle occurs in the Gospels 138 times! Now, to infer from this frequency that it is a sort of mannerism devoid of meaning would be an egregious mistake.

---

[11] Cf. the new Liddell and Scott.

All one may, perhaps, infer from its constant repetition is that it shows a certain want of literary skill in the writers; but it emphatically does not show want of feeling on their part. Quite the contrary. The effect of this imperative, whether of Semitic or of Greek origin, has long been known to scholars: it gives a peculiar *vivacity* to the style by bidding the reader *attend* to what is said or done; it often introduces something new, unexpected, startling, something which seems impossible and yet occurs.[12] Here, then, is a chance for the translator to study the context of the passage in which an ἰδοὺ occurs and find out which one of the innumerable ways of modern speech may be the one that is required to express more or less exactly the mind of the ancient writer in using it. That one cannot always be sure of its tone or color does not prove that an attempt to do justice to it should not be made. This particle is the great "Stop—Look—Listen" signal of the Gospels.

Matt. 1:20: He had *just* made up his mind to this course *when suddenly* an angel of the Lord appeared to him.

Matt. 2:1: After Jesus had been born at Bethlehem in Judea in the days of King Herod, *there was a stir one day* when Magi from the East arrived in Jerusalem.

Matt. 2:9: They obeyed the King and departed. And *unexpectedly* the star they had seen in the East kept moving before them.

Matt. 8:28–29: Two demoniacs came out of the tombs and confronted Him. They were so extremely fierce that nobody could pass that way. Yet, *strange to say*, they screamed out the words: "Leave us alone, Son of God!"

Matt. 20:18: With His mind set on going up to Jerusalem, Jesus took the Twelve aside for the sake of privacy, and said to them: "*Give me your attention*! We are going up . . ." or: "*You see*, we are going up to Jerusalem."

Luke 1:20: *And now mark what I say:* you shall be silent and unable to speak.

Luke 1:30: Do not tremble, Mary, for you have found favor in the eyes of God. *Just think:* you are to become a mother!

Luke 1:36: *Note*, moreover, that your relative Elizabeth, too, in spite of her age, has conceived a son.

Luke 1:38: *Regard me* as a humble servant of the Lord.

Luke 7:36–37: One day a Pharisee invited Him to a meal in his home. So He entered the house and reclined on a couch. And *without warning* there came in a woman who was a scandal in the town.

---

[12] Cf. *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (New York: Harper, 1889).

Luke 8:41: *Presently there came upon the scene* a man whose name was Jairus.

Luke 23:14–25: You brought this man before my tribunal, he said to them, on the ground that He incited the nation to revolt, *Now see the result:* in your presence I personally conducted the hearing, but detected no guilt in this man regarding any of the charges you preferred against Him. Nor did Herod either, for he referred His case back to us. *This, then, is the upshot:* (or: *You see, then*): He has done nothing to deserve the penalty of death.

The Gospels were written by men who had no education, men not trained in the rhetorical practice of the Greeks. They were men of the people who wrote for the people. With their eyes and ears open, they were bent on narrating what they had seen or heard. They wrote in the manner most natural to them, and that is how those numerous emotional touches came into the Gospels. It seems to me, therefore, that, in rendering the Gospels into modern English, we should try to be "natural," which, in this context, means to *feel* what the Evangelists *felt*, and then endeavor to tell this to our contemporaries. It is not enough to aim at clearness of expression; it is also necessary to retain those engaging little tricks of style[13] that reveal *our* emotional reactions, just as the Church gives wings to her emotion in the language of the liturgy. In translating the Gospels, we are deciphering Oriental documents.

The Gospels are Oriental in origin. For all that, how near they are to our Western way of thinking and feeling! To realize this, we need only imagine what they would look like had they been penned somewhere in the Far East—in the land of *Mahabharata*, for instance. No, it is not the Far East that has produced our Gospels: and that is the reason, humanly speaking, why, in spite of their Eastern provenance and their consequent frankness in expressing emotion, they are yet remarkably Western in their soberness of expression. Their pen pictures are clear-cut and sharply defined. There is nothing fantastic or grotesque in them. In the Gospels we find ourselves in a congenial atmosphere. A translator, therefore, should not hesitate

[13] The recent encyclical on biblical studies says: "It is the duty of the exegete to lay hold, so to speak, with the greatest care and reverence of *the very least expressions* which, under the inspiration of the Divine Spirit, have flowed from the pen of the sacred writer, so as to arrive at a deeper and fuller knowledge of his meaning."

to do full justice to such lively touches as he may find in them, or let himself be overawed by that ghost of "respectability" which would stifle any exhibition of emotion that is in the least beyond the ordinary tone of our matter-of-fact mode of life.

St. Louis University,
St. Louis, Mo.

JAMES A. KLEIST, S.J.

PEACE IN PRAYER

When the headlines announce, "Pope Works for Peace," the first thought, perhaps, which flashes into our minds is of diplomatic moves, encyclicals, and radio addresses. Reflection, however, will show that these are but parts of the general activity of the Pope in behalf of peace. While Pope Pius XII spends himself in the attempt to bring about a true peace upon earth there stand with him all those men who have in their turn gripped the helm of the bark of Peter, from St. Peter himself to the presently reigning Pontiff. This is no mere figure of speech, no dramatic word-picture to portray the glories of the Papacy, but a plain fact which will be overlooked by none whose planning for the world is significant.

All the Pontiffs have, each in his own way, contributed to the development and preservation of the Liturgy in which by direct prayers, by reminders of Scriptural teachings, and by memory aids, the idea of peace is driven home to the minds of men, day in and day out, week after week, and year after year, even as modern advertisers attempt to fix the name of their product in the mind of the public so that it cannot possibly be forgotten. The mentality thus created must be reckoned with, either to destroy it, if one would lead to aggression the people so influenced, or to collaborate with it, if one sincerely desires peace.

DIRECT PRAYERS

The prayers directly concerning peace which the Pontiffs have authorized for use in the public worship of the Church regard not only the peace of the Church herself, but also that of civil society, of domestic society, and of the faithful both living and dead.

We think most naturally of the votive Mass for Peace as an expression of the manner in which we should pray for peace. This Mass, aside from the reminders of Scriptural teaching in the Introit, Epistle, Gradual, Gospel, and Communion prayer, teaches us in the *Oratio*, the *Imperata* in so many dioceses today, to pray that God may give His peace, that peace which the world cannot give, so that, our hearts being devoted to His commandments and the fear of enemies being taken away, the times may, by His protection, be tranquil. The *Secreta* reiterates the idea that God protects those who are faithful to Him, while the *Postcommunio*, calling Him the author and lover of peace, asks that we may be protected from all attacks, that, trusting in His defense, we may fear no hostile arms.

The votive Mass "in time of war" reminds us that it is our sins which bring on such punishments, that when peace is restored we may correct our faults to avoid such a scourge in the future.

These votive Masses, however, do not contain the most frequently used prayers for peace. Peace for the Church herself is asked daily in the very first prayer in the Canon of the Mass, the "Te igitur . . ." In that same Canon daily, except in votive Masses for the Dead, we repeat, "Domine Jesu Christe, qui dixisti Apostolis tuis: Pacem relinquo vobis, pacem meam do vobis: ne respicias peccata mea, sed fidem Ecclesiae tuae: eamque secundum voluntatem tuam pacificare et coadunare digneris . . ."

As the seasons of the year roll by, Good Friday, with its old, old liturgy, brings us the prayer for the holy Church of God, that our God and Lord may deign to make it peaceful, unite it, and protect it in the whole world, and grant that we, living a quiet and tranquil life, may glorify God. Similarly, each year as we celebrate the Feast of Corpus Christi we recite the *Secreta* asking for the gifts of unity and peace for the Church, gifts which are mystically indicated under the offerings made at Mass to Him. The *Secreta* of the votive Mass for the removal of schism has likewise an appeal for peace and unity in the Church.

Mindful of the fact that God has willed that civil society be set up to look after the temporal needs of man even as she herself was established to look after man's spiritual needs, the Church prays for that society, asking that it, too, may enjoy peace. First of all, she prays that the supreme overlordship of God, the God of Peace, may be recognized as her divine Founder taught her to pray, "Pater noster . . . adveniat regnum tuum . . ." and this she has us repeat daily in the Canon of the Mass.

In that same series of ancient prayers repeated each Good Friday is included the prayer for the emperor, who was considered the head of civil society for so many centuries, that God may make subject to him all barbarous nations for our perpetual peace. The following day, Holy Saturday, toward the end of the long chant for the blessing of the Paschal Candle, God is asked to look upon the emperor and grant the tranquillity of perpetual peace. Among the *Orationes diversae*, too, the *Secreta* and *Postcommunio* for an emperor as well as the *Post-*

communio for a king ask for peace. The peace of civil society lies close to the heart of the Church, for if men are continually at each others' throats it becomes that much more difficult to preach the Gospel of peace and of love of God and of one's neighbor, which is the mission of the Church upon earth.

The activity of the Popes for peace has not, however, been restricted to the larger societies, the Church and the State. It has busied itself likewise with the nucleus of all society, the family. The second prayer inserted in the Canon of the Mass in the votive Mass *pro Sponso et Sponsa* used at weddings begs God to grant that the wife may be a source of peace in the family, and for both the bride and the groom the *Postcommunio* of that Mass asks lasting peace.

For the faithful the Church prays daily in the Canon of the Mass, "Hanc igitur . . ." and "Libera nos . . ." that we may have peace in our days and be safe from all disturbance. During the year the *Oratio* for the second Sunday after Epiphany asks that peace be granted to our times, while the *Oratio* so frequently used to ask the prayers of the Saints on semi-double feasts begs that we be given peace so that adversities and errors being destroyed, the Church may serve God with assured freedom.

Even the prayer for the blessing of the palms on Palm Sunday affords an opportunity to pray for peace. The chant in the blessing of the Paschal Candle contains likewise a petition for peace for the faithful. The *Oratio* for the Monday within the Octave of Pentecost asks again for peace for those to whom God has given the gift of faith, and as the ecclesiastical year draws to a close the thought of peace returns in the *Oratio* for the twentieth Sunday after Pentecost.

Each day through her ministers, in the "Visita, quaesumus, Domine . . ." of Compline, the Church prays that we may dwell in peace. On Thursday of the second week of Lent we pray that, aided by God's grace, we who are fittingly intent upon fasting and prayer may be free of enemies whether of mind or of body. The same desire for peace is expressed in the second prayer for the Commemoration of the Saints in the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin.

When there is danger of disturbance among her children the Church has the prayer for preservation of harmony in the congregation asking God, the bestower of peace, to give to His servants true conformity with His will. In the *Postcommunio* for devoted friends she has us ask for prosperity and peace for them, showing how much store she puts by peace, and even when we pray for our enemies she teaches us to ask that they may all be given peace and true brotherly love.

When we commend to God's mercy a dying person, the Church has us ask that his place may that day be one of peace, and daily she has us remember the dead in the Canon of the Mass, speaking of them as sleeping the sleep of peace, asking that they and all who rest in Christ be granted a place of peace, while in the specific *Oratio* for a deceased person or persons she has us pray again that he or they be established in a place of peace.

REMINDERS

The reminders of Scriptural teachings in the Missal are to be found primarily, of course, in the verses chosen for the Epistles and Gospels in the cycle of the ecclesiastical year and for the feasts of the various Saints. Scriptural passages referring to peace are to be found also in the Introit and *Communio*, and in the Gradual, Tract, or Alleluja verse for Paschal time.[1]

In the Divine Office, aside from the passages from Sacred Scripture arranged to be read in the first nocturne among which the reminders of Scriptural teaching on peace are to be found, the responsories after the lessons of the various nocturnes keep fresh in our memories, by their frequent repetition, the idea that our peace comes to us from God who has sent us a Peacemaker.[2] The reminders are also to be found in the antiphons, in the *Capitulum*,[3] and in the *Benedictio* before some lessons.[4]

The antiphons impress upon us that God will bless His people in peace,[5] that He is the Prince of Peace,[6] that He is made great above all the earth,[7] that in His days peace will arise in abundance,[8] for men of good will,[9] and that one must be vigilant to guard his possessions in peace.[10] Sometimes the peace is false,[11] but the reward for a man of peace will be the Beatific Vision,[12] and God will hear those who cry to Him and grant them peace.[13] These antiphons also remind us that Christ gives a peace,[14] such as the world cannot give.[15] As a result, these antiphons have us praying daily that we may rest in peace protected by God.[16] They also exhort us to serve God in holiness that He may free us from our enemies,[17] or have us exclaim at the joy of dwelling together as brethren.[18] They ask Him to come and visit us in peace that we may rejoice before Him in a perfect heart,[19] or remind us that a gift to God is useless while we are not reconciled to our neighbor.[20] They remind us that it is God who makes peace,[21] and ask that He may direct us in the way of peace and prosperity.[22]

---

[1] Cf., for example, "Alleluja, alleluja. Virga Jesse floruit: Virgo Deum et hominem genuit: pacem Deus reddidit, in se reconcilians ima summis. Alleluja . . ." (Common of feasts of the Blessed Virgin); cf. also *Secreta, ibid.*

[2] "Laetentur caeli . . . Orietur in diebus ejus justitia, et abundantia pacis" (Mondays, Advent); "Ecce, ab Austro venio . . . Visitare vos in pace . . ." (Tuesdays, Advent); "Ecce, Dominus veniet . . . visitare populum suum in pace, et constituere super eum vitam sempiternam . . ." (Wednesday, second week of Advent); "Bethlehem . . . et pax erit in terra nostra, dum venerit. *V.* Loquetur pacem in gentibus, et potestas ejus a mari usque ad mare" (Third Sunday of Advent); "Descendet Dominus . . . orietur in diebus . . . abundantia pacis . . . " (Third Sunday of Advent); "Clama in fortitudine, qui annuntias pacem in Jerusalem . . . " (Ember Wednesday, Advent); "Juravi . . . testamentum pacis erit in Jerusalem . . ." (Wednesday, fourth week of Advent); and "Hodie nobis . . . et in terra pax hominibus bonae voluntatis" (First responsory, Christmas).

[3] Cf. Prime on ferial days and common vigils; None, Second Sunday of Advent; and the Common of Several Martyrs.

[4] In the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin, for instance; cf. also the *Benedictio* for the *lectio brevis* at Prime.

MEMORY AIDS

The Church finds in the various hymns, versicles, litanies, and especially the "kiss of peace," memory aids which serve to impress the thought of peace deeply upon the minds of her children.

Beside the *Gloria in excelsis* in the Mass we find the hymns for the hours of the Divine Office. In the second stanza of the hymn for Prime God is asked to control our tongues lest strife arise. In the second stanza of the hymn for Sext we ask that the flames of conflict be extinguished and true peace of heart granted. On the feast of Pentecost the fifth stanza of the hymn *Veni, Creator Spiritus* teaches us, singing, to ask that the enemy be driven off and peace granted, so that, with the Holy Spirit as our guide, we may escape every harm. On that same day the sixth stanza of the hymn for Lauds asks for quiet times.

---

[5] Cf. Lauds, Mondays.

[6] Cf. Lauds, Fourth Sunday of Advent.

[7] Cf. First Vespers, Christmas.

[8] Cf. second nocturne, Christmas.

[9] Cf. Lauds, Christmas.

[10] Cf. antiphon for the *Benedictus*, Third Sunday of Lent.

[11] Cf. first nocturne, Feast of the Sacred Heart.

[12] Cf First Vespers, Common of Apostles.

[13] Cf. second nocturne, Common of Confessors.

[14] Cf. antiphon for the *Benedictus*, Tuesday within the Octave of Easter; also for the *Magnificat*, Saturday within the Octave of Easter; for the *Benedictus* and *Magnificat* on Low Sunday; for the *Magnificat*, Monday within the first week after the Octave of Easter; and for the *Benedictus*, Tuesday within the fourth week after the Octave of Easter.

[15] Cf. antiphon for the *Magnificat*, Tuesday within the Octave of Pentecost.

[16] Cf. antiphon for the *Nunc dimittis*, Compline.

[17] Cf. antiphon for the *Benedictus*, Thursdays.

[18] Cf. Vespers, Thursdays.

[19] Cf. antiphon for the *Magnificat*, Saturday before the Second Sunday of Advent.

[20] Cf. antiphon for the *Magnificat*, Fifth Sunday after Pentecost.

[21] Cf. antiphon for the *Magnificat*, Saturdays before the First and Fifth Sundays of October.

[22] Cf. *Itinerarium.*

During the summer the hymn at Lauds on Sundays asks for the good gifts of continual peace, and when the feast of several martyrs is celebrated we are reminded that the removal of guilt goes with peace, which is desirable that we may glorify God.

The versicles drill into us such ideas as these: "Fiat pax in virtute tua,"[23] "Pax vobis,"[24] "Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum,"[25] "Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi: dona nobis pacem,"[26] "Dominus det nobis suam pacem,"[27] "Procedamus in pace,"[28] "Anima ejus (Animae eorum) et animae omnium fidelium defunctorum per misericordiam Dei requiescant in pace,"[29] "Fidelium animae per misericordiam Dei requiescant in pace,"[30] "Requiescant in pace."[31]

The litanies, translated into so many languages, impress upon us such ideas as: "Jesus, God of peace . . .,"[32] "Heart of Jesus, our peace and reconciliation . . .,"[33] "Queen of peace . . .,"[34] "That to Christian kings and princes thou deign to give true peace and concord . . .,"[35] "That to the entire Christian people thou deign to grant peace and unity . . .,"[36] "From pestilence, famine, and war, free us, O Lord."[37]

---

[23] *Preces*, Lauds and Vespers.

[24] Bishop's salutation before *Oratio* at Mass.

[25] Canon of the Mass.

[26] Canon of the Mass.

[27] Versicle before the Antiphon of the Blessed Virgin at the end of the Office, also at the end of the prayers before and after meals.

[28] Versicle at the end of the *Itinerarium*.

[29] Versicle toward the end of the *Absolutio super tumulum*.

[30] Versicle at the end of each hour of the Divine Office, except Compline.

[31] Versicle toward the end of Masses for the Dead, and in the Office of the Dead.

[32] Litany of the Holy Name of Jesus.

[33] Litany of the Sacred Heart.

[34] Litany of Loretto of the Blessed Virgin Mary

[35] Litany of the Saints, said on Rogation Days and during the Forty Hours Devotion.

[36] Litany of the Saints.

[37] Litany of the Saints.

Perhaps the most vivid expression of the peace and charity which should exist among Christians, however, is brought home to her children by the Church when, just before Holy Communion, she has them exchange the kiss of peace with the words, "Pax tecum." This old ceremony, once practiced by all the faithful present at Mass (when they were fewer in numbers and could do so easily), which had each member of the congregation embracing his neighbor as a brother in a spirit of love, no matter who he might be or what his condition in life, is a most graphic expression of the love which exists among all members of the body of Christ and serves at the same time to impress upon the minds of those present that, no matter what divisions may exist in human society, there are to be no divisions among those who are incorporated in Christ, so that there should be no wars or contentions among them but only the greatest peace and charity as befits those who are children dwelling in the house of God.

In view of all that we have thus far pointed out, is it to be wondered that those who plan to lead their people into unprovoked war first silence the Church and attempt to root out her teachings from the minds of her children?

The Catholic University of America, THOMAS OWEN MARTIN.
Washington, D. C.

CATHOLICS ON THE POLICE FORCE

The police force is an essential requirement for the preservation and the well-being of society. In modern times it would be impossible for a large city to dispense with its corps of police for a single day without becoming a prey to hopeless confusion and disorder. Even the small community must have its sheriff and its constable. Nowadays the functions of the police are quite extensive and varied. Policemen are not merely the protectors of the citizenry against crime, deputed to bring to court those who violate the law. They are expected to perform many other functions in order to render safer and more expeditious the activities of their fellow-citizens: to direct traffic, to rescue people in danger of drowning or of asphyxiation, to provide bewildered travellers with information about buses and streetcars, to seek lost children, to give first aid in cases of accident, and to make themselves generally useful in the numerous other critical situations that the complexity of modern life can bring about.

A large proportion of the police in the United States, particularly in the northeastern section, are Catholics. This is true, not only of the ordinary patrolmen and minor officials, but also of the higher officials, such as inspectors and commissioners. On the whole, Catholics have reason to be proud of their co-religionists who are members of the police force. Most of them are faithful to their obligations of attendance at Mass and of reception of the sacraments. Their respect for the clergy is proverbial. Their names appear frequently among those cited for special bravery in the line of duty. As a class they are good family men, devoted to their wives and children, eager to give their boys and girls a good education. Many a priest in our country is justly proud of the fact that his father was a faithful and loyal member of the police force.

The moral theologians have very little to say about the specific duties of a policeman. The main reason for this would seem to be that until comparatively recent times the police force as a purely civil organization was unknown. The army maintained order, and even today the police organization of the Continent partakes largely of a military character. The English system, from which the American is copied, began only in 1828.[1] Consequently, the older theologians made no mention of the moral obligations of policemen as distinct from soldiers, and modern theologians have given little attention to the subject, even though there are a considerable number of moral problems relative to the functions of a policeman which should be discussed in the light of Catholic theological principles. This present paper is an attempt to propose some of these problems and to suggest solutions.

---

[1] Cf. *Encyclopedia Americana* (Chicago, 1940), XXII, 301.

Like every practical Catholic, the policeman who is a member of the one true Church should view his place in life from the supernatural aspect. The Catholic policeman should regard his office, not merely as a job that gives him a comfortable and respectable livelihood, but primarily as a deputation to protect and to enforce the law of God, which is reflected in every just civil law. He should realize, too, that his position provides him with many opportunities of practising Christian charity. He should bear in mind that when he is rendering a service to his fellow-man, even if it is only telling a person how to get to a certain street, he should be actuated with a supernatural motive, and thus become worthy of Our Lord's commendation: "Amen, I say to you, as long as you did it for one of these, the least of my brethren, you did it for me."[2]

A policeman must be a vigorous and decisive man, but that does not mean that he must be harsh and rude. The Catholic policeman who is habitually rough and discourteous is certainly a poor example of the virtue of charity as taught by his Church. The policeman should be impressed with the dignity of an office which contributes so effectively toward the stability and the protection of society, and the Catholic can be best imbued with this spirit of appreciation by understanding and properly applying the doctrine of the Mystical Body. It may seem a far cry from this sublime doctrine to the task of keeping traffic moving smoothly at a busy street corner, but it is of the essence of practical Catholicity to supernaturalize even the most prosaic things of daily life.

The duties of a policeman involve the virtue of religion, for he has taken a solemn oath to fulfill them faithfully. Consequently, a grave and deliberate neglect of these duties adds to the sin he commits against his fellow-men a mortal sin against the second commandment of God, the infraction of a promissory oath. To take a practical example: the patrolman assigned to a section of a city where theft is common would be guilty of a grave neglect of duty if he passed several hours of his night shift in some secluded spot, soundly asleep. He would sin against both justice and religion, and the Catholic policeman would have to mention both these transgressions in confession. Even in the event that no harm is done while this gross neglect of duty is taking place, the policeman has sinned gravely in providing an opportunity for crime which he was obliged to prevent.

---

[2] *Matt.* 25: 40.

The duty which the policeman undertakes to support law and order puts him in a very different category from the ordinary employee in the matter of going on strike. The men employed by a private concern are justified in striking, if this is the only means of redress against grave injustice. But it can hardly ever happen that policemen will be justified in going on strike. In this respect the police force is like the army—so necessary to the public welfare that even grave personal injustice must be borne for the sake of society, which would be seriously imperiled by a general walkout. In extreme cases, a strike of of the police could be justifiable, as could the revolt of an army; but such cases are very rare. Recently, the strike of the policemen of Paris during the final days of the German occupation occasioned much rioting and disorder; but the members of the Parisian police force considered themselves justified in resorting to this measure on the grounds that it was a means of delivering their nation from the yoke of Nazi oppression.

It seems hardly necessary to state that under no circumstances may the policeman violate the law of God, even though the purpose may be the detection and the suppression of the worst form of vice. Thus, it has happened that a detective, in order to have evidence that a certain establishment was a house of prostitution, patronized the place himself. Again, sometimes an agent of the law pretends to be in favor of some subversive organization and goes to the extent of taking an oath of loyalty to its false principles, in order to gain information about its activities from within. Such means of protecting the law, being intrinsically wrong, are never permissible. There is an essential difference between methods of this kind and those which involve only the transgression of a civil law, such as the participation in gambling by a detective in order to secure a conviction.

Drunkenness is a most pernicious vice in the case of a policeman. Even though he does not go to the extreme of complete intoxication, he may commit a serious sin if he drinks enough to render himself notably less capable of performing the duties expected of him while patrolling his beat—of pursuing a thief, of shooting accurately, of stopping a runaway horse. Police officials cannot be blamed for being most severe on those members of the force who fail in this respect. An experienced police chaplain informed me that he strongly advises the patrolmen never to take a single drink of intoxicating liquor while on duty or during a period of four hours previously.

The policeman is bound to endure danger in the performance of his duty, sometimes to the extent of risking his life. This is not merely an obligation of charity, as in the case of the private citizen—it is an obligation of justice. Thus, the policeman must endeavor to arrest a dangerous criminal, even though it involves serious danger; he must try to kill a mad dog, even though he himself may be bitten by the frenzied animal. Certain qualifications must be made, however, in this connection. It is forbidden to risk one's life when the desired effect can be obtained more safely in a less glamorous fashion, or when it is practically certain that the attempt cannot succeed. Thus, the policeman who endeavors to capture a band of criminals singlehandedly, when he could just as well wait for a squad of police to assist him, may succeed and gain a reputation for bravery, but in reality he risked his own life unnecessarily and rendered the capture of the malefactors less probable merely for his own glorification. Similarly, to attempt a rescue that is morally impossible at the risk of one's own life bespeaks a lack of common sense, not a high degree of valor, whatever ideas the popular mind may entertain on this subject.

In the use of a weapon, particularly a revolver, the policeman must remember that it is not within his province to inflict punishment for crime. When he captures a criminal who has just attacked a frail girl or killed an innocent child, his feelings may prompt him to give the depraved man a beating that he will never forget; but that is not permitted either by civil or by divine law. He may inflict only as much physical force as is necessary to subdue the lawbreaker and induce him to submit to arrest without resistance. Similarly, when the policeman is pursuing a criminal, he may not shoot with the idea of killing him if he can capture him by merely inflicting a wound. Only on the supposition that the particular criminal will probably try to kill the policeman, in the event that he is merely wounded, may the officer "shoot to kill." However, if a murderer, or a thief who has stolen a large sum of money, can be apprehended only by inflicting a mortal wound, this is permissible. On the other hand, it would be wrong for a policeman to use a gun with the danger of inflicting death on a person trying to escape after a slight transgression, such as the violation of a minor traffic regulation or the breaking of a window. The advantage to society of bringing such a person to justice is not sufficient to compensate for the jeopardizing of a human life.

Undoubtedly, the custom of the "third degree" prevails in some places, though it is impossible to say how general it is, because those who have recourse to this method are naturally loathe to publish the fact. The "third degree" means that when the police have grave suspicions that a prisoner has been guilty of a crime, they inflict on him physical sufferings until they extort a confession or perhaps even induce him to reveal his accomplices. In a word, it is simply a modern version of the medieval practice of torturing those accused of a crime. It might be well for those "enlightened and humane" persons who vehemently condemn the practices of the Inquisition to direct their efforts toward eliminating this feature of present-day American life. At any rate, the "third degree," when it includes such measures as beating the accused or depriving him of food and drink and sleep until he is almost out of his mind, is absolutely wrong, and any Catholic policeman or detective who would participate in it should regard such participation as a matter of confession. One who attempts to justify himself on the score that the "third degree" often succeeds in wringing a confession from a guilty person (a statement which is undoubtedly true) is simply making use of the erroneous ethical principle that the end justifies the means. At most, it would be permissible to use a mild form of the "third degree" to the extent of questioning the prisoner for a long time so that eventually he would be caught in a contradiction or would be weary enough to admit his guilt. But even such a course would be permitted to the police only when they are practically certain that they have captured the real criminal.

There are many occasions in which a policeman is liable to violate justice, if he is not most conscientious in the performance of his duties. If, because of culpable neglect on his part, a citizen suffers some property loss, the policeman incurs the obligation of restitution as a negative co-operator. Thus, if a patrolman neglected to make his rounds properly on a certain night, and a robbery took place which would certainly not have occurred had he been faithful to his duty, he has the obligation of making restitution to the injured party, in the event that the stolen property is not restored or there is no probability that it will be restored. This obligation falls on the policeman by virtue of the natural law even though no indictment or punishment accrues to him from the civil authorities.

May a policeman accept gifts from the residents or shopkeepers of the district he patrols? As far as the law of God is concerned, and abstracting from any civil ordinances, he may do so, if these donations are merely gifts in the true sense of the term. It is not unusual for merchants to give a courteous and vigilant patrolman a substantial gift from time to time, particularly at Christmas. But such gifts must not take on the nature of payment for service in such wise that those who do not contribute will not receive the service which the policeman is bound to render by reason of his office. If that is the tacit or express understanding between policeman and citizens, there would be an obligation of restoring the so-called gifts, which in such a case would be simply the fruits of unjust extortion.

Since he is bound to safeguard the law impartially, the policeman is failing in his duty if he tolerates transgressions by certain individuals for personal reasons. If he allows his friends to keep their stores open beyond the closing hour while he enforces the city ordinances strictly in the case of others, he is doing wrong. The policeman who has reason to believe that a robbery was committed by the son of a fellow-policeman may be very reluctant to take action, but he must abstract from the ties of friendship and report the suspect or arrest him, as he would a complete stranger. The common good of society must supersede personal feelings. There are indeed occasions when a policeman may lawfully exercise a measure of discretionary authority in the matter of making an arrest, particularly in the case of a young person who has been guilty of some minor offence. The officer may have reason to believe that the culprit will be more readily induced to amend if he is left free with an admonition, instead of being subjected to the unhealthy atmosphere of courtroom and prison. The prudent use of such discretionary power is fully compatible with Catholic principles and ideals. But the determining factor in such cases must be the moral welfare of the individual concerned and ultimately the common good, not considerations of personal friendship.

It is even more reprehensible to abstain from making an arrest or from enforcing the law in return for a bribe. The opportunities for this form of "graft"—at times, on an incredibly large scale—constitute one of the gravest moral dangers to the members of the police force at the present time in the United States. Of course, bribery must be condemned, without qualification, according to Catholic moral principles. Even when the case centers about a transgression which is not of a criminal nature, such as a traffic violation, the officer who accepts money and in return abstains from making the arrest or issuing the summons is committing a sin against legal justice and is violating his contract and oath. The question naturally arises whether or not the policeman has any obligation of making restitution. It would seem that he would not be bound to indemnify the state or city for the fine which the guilty person, on conviction, would have been obligated to pay.[3] On the other hand, if a third party has suffered some loss of property as a result of the policeman's dishonesty (as would be the case if the bribe enabled a thief to escape with stolen goods) there is certainly an obligation of restitution incumbent on the policeman toward the injured party.

There are times, however, when there is no appreciable harm done to anyone's material possessions as a result of the policeman's neglect of duty by reason of bribery—for example, when he condones a traffic violation or the selling of liquor beyond the stated hour at night. Must the policeman who grants immunity in such cases in return for a bribe give up the money? Some apply to this problem the principles of a sinful contract, according to which one who has actually fulfilled an obligation may keep the recompense, even though the fulfillment was a sinful deed.[4] I hestitate to accept this solution in the case of an official who has accepted a bribe for granting immunity from the due process of law, because this case involves certain features which are not present in the sinful contract between private individuals. What the policeman sells in the case under consideration is something which can be lawfully granted only by public authority, freedom from the duty of standing trial. In other words, the policeman steals from the government the power of granting immunity and then sells it. Accordingly, the principles applicable to the stealing and selling of any commodity should be applied in this case. If it is possible, the officer should restore the bribe to the one who gave it and then make the arrest, thus taking back the immunity. If this is no longer possible—for example, if the culprit cannot be found—the money should be given to the government, or at least distributed in charity. Unfortunately, there is not enough consideration given to the violations of *commutative* justice involved in the American practice of "graft" with the consequent obligation of restitution.

One form of bribe-taking for the granting of immunity from the law is particularly reprehensible,—that which concerns houses of prostitution or abortion clinics. It is worth noting that even those members of the police force who are inclined to indulge in other forms of graft usually stay aloof from gain accruing from these forms of vice. There are, indeed, cities in which prostitution is tolerated as the lesser of two evils, on the grounds that unless there is a restricted district where prostitution is not interfered with, vice will be more rampant and widespread. Those who have made a thorough study of the matter are convinced that this is an erroneous notion.[5] However, in a city where this idea is applied in practice by the authorities, the patrolman may follow the decision of his superiors and abstain from interference. Needless to say, he would be forbidden by the law of God from directing anyone to one of these haunts. Moreover, in those places where the civil law endeavors to stamp out prostitution, the policeman who would accept a bribe for granting immunity would not only be guilty of the violation of his obligation to society and the transgression of his oath, but would also be a co-operator toward the sins of impurity that are committed in the houses which he allows to remain open.

---

[3] Cf. Aertnys-Damen, *Theologia Moralis* (Turin, 1939), Vol. I, n. 787.

[4] Cf. *ibid.*, n. 846.

Not infrequently Catholic policemen show special attention toward priests. There can be no reasonable objection to such a procedure when the reason for the special favor is the priest's ministerial activity. If a patrolman accompanies a priest through a lonely section of the city on a night sick call, or if the traffic director allows the priest driving to an accident to disregard the red light, they are acknowledging that the benefit which the priest's ministrations confer on society justify special consideration. Again, the discretionary power mentioned above can sometimes be employed by a policeman in favor of a clergyman, on the principle that an intelligent and honest citizen, who may have failed against some minor ordinance, will be sufficiently warned against future negligence by a courteous admonition instead of being haled into court. As a police official expressed it: "Clergymen do not take undue advantage of their position, and hence the police are inclined to be lenient with the clergy of all denominations." But there are times when a policeman would be doing wrong in disregarding the conduct of a clergyman,—for example, if the latter regularly drives his car in a manner dangerous to the lives of others, or if he is found to be intoxicated while driving. The protection of society should be the first consideration in such cases, and no clergyman can reasonably expect any special immunity from the police if he is guilty of conduct of this nature.

---

[5] Cf. J. O'Brien in *The Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, XXIX, 1 (Oct. 1938), 33.

The Catholic policeman should realize that his office entails special danger to life, and consequently he has a graver obligation than the ordinary citizen of being prepared for a sudden death. It is very important that he should remain habitually in the state of grace. Priests who have pastoral obligations toward members of the police force should consider it their duty to give these men detailed instructions relative to their specific duties and also should urge them to receive the sacraments frequently, both because of the danger in which they constantly live and because of the special assistance they need from God to be faithful to their obligations as guardians of law and protectors of society.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.
The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

THE AUDIENCE FACTOR IN PREACHING

It was Sunday morning and Father Murphy was scheduled to preach. Father Murphy was not a vain man, but he could not help thinking that his sermon was good. He was confident with the confidence that comes from preparation. He had worked hard on his sermon, very hard. He had not waited like some of his confreres till Saturday night and frantically grabbed a sermon book from the shelf, hoping to find a few ideas upon which he could drift the following morning. He had started the preparation for his sermon on Monday. He had devoted, each day, two hours of his precious and much-encroached-upon time to the construction and writing of his sermon. He had even given up a round of golf to stick with his sermon; and Father Murphy liked golf.

For his material he had thumbed the pages of the *Summa* of St. Thomas; delved into the Fathers; consulted the decrees of the Council of Trent; searched the Scriptures for appropriate texts. Father Murphy believed in first-class sources. He had also used painstaking care that the expression of his ideas would meet with the approval of grammarians and rhetoricians.

Saturday morning, his sermon was completed. He read the finished product of his mental labors with evident satisfaction. He practiced his sermon aloud several times. Such a fine sermon must be fittingly delivered.

It is not hard to understand why Father Murphy was so confident when he ascended the pulpit of St. Jerome's Church. Feeling assured of success, he launched into his sermon. He was anxious to get his message off his chest. He had but started the body of his sermon when he noticed that the people were not paying attention. Some women were actually telling their beads; several young ladies seemed more interested in the styles of their neighbors than in his sermon; and, Heaven forbid, some even gave all the external signs of being asleep. Father Murphy's confidence collapsed like a pricked balloon. He knew now how St. Peter felt when he cried out, "Lord, save us! we perish." With a display of great fortitude he finished his sermon and descended from the pulpit, a disillusioned man. He was now firmly convinced that preachers are born, not made. Had he not labored diligently? Was not the orthodoxy of his sermon beyond dispute?

St. Thomas himself would give it the nod. He would defy even Genung to find a flaw in his writing. Had he not been earnest in delivery? Why had he failed? Father Murphy was puzzled.

If Father Murphy could have listened to the remarks of his auditors as they strolled home, he would have discovered the cause of his failure. "Did you understand what the sermon was all about?" "No, but Father is certainly a learned man." "Did you ever hear such strange sounding words?" "Faith, 'tis a shame that the Bishop didn't appoint him to teach in the seminary instead of making a parish priest out of him."

Father Murphy had made the fatal mistake of not considering his audience. In writing and delivering his sermon, he became so engrossed in his own ideas, so impressed by facts that seemed important to him that he forgot that the knowledge and interests of his audience differed widely from his own. There are many priests like Father Murphy. They work hard but are not effective preachers because they ignore the audience factor in preaching.

Preaching is communication. Successfully to communicate ideas, the preacher must consider carefully the receivers of his communication. He must adapt his message to suit his audience. The preacher should never for a moment forget the old Scholastic axiom: "Quidquid recipitur, secundum modum recipientis, recipitur."

One of the most important lessons that a preacher can learn is to see things from the viewpoint of his audience. He should constantly ask himself, "Would I understand this point with their background? Would this be interesting to me if I were they? How would I feel about this if I were in their position." The ability of the preacher to project himself by means of his imagination into the lives of his listeners is essential for effective preaching.

The audience factor should influence the preacher in the selection of a subject, guide him in the choice of a purpose, modify the building of his sermon, determine the choice of words, and control his delivery during the actual presentation of the sermon.

The first step for the preacher even before selecting a subject and determining his purpose is to analyze his audience. He should try to get a composite mental picture of his hearers; their age, their sex, their education. The success of the sermon depends to a large extent on the accuracy of this measurement. A tailor would be considered ridiculous who would endeavor to make the man fit the suit instead of the suit fit the man. Is not the preacher who tries to make the audience fit the sermon rather than the sermon fit the audience equally ridiculous? What is referred to here is the manner of presentation. The preacher is never at liberty to tamper with truth in order to suit the audience. The audience must be made to conform to truth, not vice versa.

To obtain a composite picture of his hearers, the preacher must first consider their age. Age affects greatly the ability to understand. Again the interests of different age groups differ widely. A sermon that would evoke a good response from an adult group might prove a dud at a Children's Mass.

The sex of the audience is another factor to be considered. Men and women differ in their interests, though at times these overlap. If the congregation is mixed, certain subjects must be handled in a manner different from that which could be employed if all the members were of one sex.

No mental picture of the audience would be complete without considering their mental acumen and education. Will the preacher's audience be a special one? Will it consist of college students, doctors, nurses, religious or will it be the usual cross-section Sunday congregation? The average congregation is made up of individuals who differ widely in mental ability and educational background. The group includes those who have had only the benefit of a grammar school education and extends to those who have had the benefit of a university training. Naturally, the educational background of the audience should influence the preacher in the selection and treatment of the matter of his sermon, the choice of words, etc. As regards the education of the audience, it should be borne in mind that while individuals may have had the benefit of higher training, they may be woefully ignorant in matters of religion. Some professional men know less about their religion than does a twelve year old schoolboy.

Although it is incumbent upon the preacher so to construct his sermon that it will be understood by the least intelligent amongst his auditors, he should not make the mistake of underestimating his audience. An adult congregation is capable of following sound arguments and is not satisfied with puerile ones. Neither do adults relish childish illustrations. They desire substance in a sermon, and are not pleased with preacher who presents them with mere froth.

In the selection of a subject, the audience factor should not be overlooked. Sometimes the preacher will find the subject already determined for him by the occasion or by diocesan statutes. However, many times he is at liberty to select his own subject. The audience—their particular needs—should be a guide to the preacher. It is well to remember that most Catholics are eager to hear all the truths of Christian revelation and not a mere repetition of essential truths. There is no revealed doctrine that the audience is not capable of understanding if it is presented in an apt manner. Pope Pius XII, in his admirable encyclical, *Mystici Corporis*, has this to say: "Mysteries revealed by God can not be harmful to men; nor should they remain as treasures hidden in a field, useless."[1]

To determine his purpose the preacher must decide what particular response he desires from his audience. Does he want his audience to understand better some point of doctrine, to be convinced of a certain truth, to realize more deeply one of the eternal realities, to be moved to perform some definite action? It seems only obvious that anyone who gives a sermon would take time out in advance to determine what he wishes to accomplish. Common observation, however, shows that much preaching is carried on without any regard for clearly defined purposes. Vagueness of purpose is the result of failing to consider one's audience and to determine what response one wants from them.

In the arrangement of his matter, too, the preacher must not forget the nature of the persons to whom he hopes to communicate his ideas. The unspoiled human mind is logical. If the preacher hopes to influence his listeners, he must arrange his matter in a clear, logical order. He must take care that no step in the logical process is omitted. The relationship of ideas may be as clear as the noonday sun in his own mind; but unless he clearly indicates the *nexus* between his ideas, many in the audience may fail to perceive the relationship. Most individuals in the congregation are not capable of, or at least do not enjoy, jumping mental steps.

In constructing his sermon, the preacher must similarly take into consideration the psychological principles that govern the operation of the human mind. The preacher must remember that he cannot cram things down people's throats. As Monroe so well says: "He should try to lead the thoughts of his audience naturally rather than force them arbitrarily."[2] He should make the structure of his sermon conform to the thinking process of his listeners.

To communicate ideas, the preacher must first secure the attention of the audience. Attention is absolutely necessary for mental receptivity. In the arrangement of his sermon, it would be well if the preacher kept before his mind the fact that in actual delivery he will have to compete for the attention of his audience. Certain external factors, such as noise in the church, the bizarre headgear of certain women, the attractive or peculiar appearance of certain members of the congregation, are constantly competing with the preacher for attention. However, the most formidable competitors of the preacher in bidding for attention are those within the minds of his auditors. Thoughts of last night's movie, of dinner, of business difficulties, of a vacation, of a headache, are no mean adversaries to be conquered by a speaker.

---

[1] NCWC translation, n. 10, p. 8.

[2] Alan H. Monroe, *Principles and Types of Speech* (New York: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1940), p. 186.

Realizing that no sermon can be effective if the audience will not listen, the preacher should so arrange his matter that the attention of the audience is secured at the very beginning of the sermon. There are several methods which are effective in capturing the attention of the audience: starting with a striking illustration or an apt story, a rhetorical question, a quotation, a reference to the occasion, a graphic word-picture of some person or scene.

Possibly the best way the preacher has of securing the attention of the audience is by linking up his sermon with the needs of the audience. The preacher can learn much from the technique of advertisers in this respect. Advertisers gain attention and move to action by appealing to fundamental human wants. The audience will listen attentively to that which in some way concerns them. The preacher should lead the people to feel that they have a need for the information that he is going to impart or that they have a need for doing what he suggests. Williamson in his book, *Speaking in Public*, has this to say:

> The most vital and fundamental means of getting hold of people's minds and getting them to continue to listen is by relating what is said to what concerns them—the problems of life that are vital to them, their wishes, their felt needs. All of us are actuated by certain basic, fundamental human wants and practically all our interests are conditioned to one extent or another by these wants, which may not even be recognized by us but which are, nevertheless, insistent. To touch upon these wants, to arouse them in the listeners by showing what the speaker discusses is related definitely to what affects them and the things they want to do in life, is almost the surest of all means of getting attention.[3]

[3] Arleigh B. Williamson, M. A., *Speaking in Public* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1940), p. 347.

Another way of maintaining interest is by making use of the familiar. Our Divine Savior, who knew so well the workings of the human mind because He fashioned it, is the outstanding exponent of this technique. In His parables He takes the abstract concepts of supernatural revelation and makes them clear to the audience by comparing them with things and experiences with which His auditors were well acquainted. The people of Palestine in the time of Our Lord were an agricultural people. Christ, therefore, compared the Kingdom of Heaven to a man who sowed seed in his field, to a mustard seed, to a fig tree, to a laborer who hired workmen for his vineyard, etc. The preacher who employs the familiar brings his message within the vivid experience of his audience. When the preacher presents his ideas in terms of the knowledge and experience of his auditors, he is on the avenue that leads into their minds. Such a preacher will find no great difficulty in maintaining interest.

Another contributing factor in maintaining interest is the employment of the concrete. A modern book on public speaking defined the concrete as follows: "The concrete is what we perceive sensibly, and, by an extension of meaning it is that which is definite, which has for us vital perceptible reality."[4] The preacher should select material that is concrete whenever it is possible to do so. The old rule of supporting abstract statements with concrete illustrations should be scrupulously followed. The preacher who talks in abstractions will find it almost impossible to maintain interest. Lack of concreteness puts too much of a strain on the minds of the listeners. Realizing that all human knowledge is dependent upon the senses, the preacher should try to stimulate the internal senses, the imagination and sense memory, by the employment of concrete language. In listening, it requires very little effort to understand what is said if the ideas are given in pictures so that the listeners can in their imagination see and feel what it is all about.

How much more interesting is the concrete than the abstract will be illustrated by the following example: (Abstract) The desire for pleasure which God has instilled into you is good but it must be regulated by right reason; otherwise, it will work havoc in your lives. (Concrete) You are all acquainted with the wonderful productivity and usefulness of water power. The force of water if properly harnessed will light the lamps of city streets, push street cars, turn the wheels of industry; but let the mighty force of surging water get out of control and it will destroy homes and buildings, it will snuff out lives, it will wipe out whole villages and towns. So likewise your instinct for pleasure, if kept under proper control, will make for useful, fruitful, and happy lives; but once let the drive for pleasure overthrow the control of reason and it will ensnare a man, it will brutally trample on the rights of others, it will bring misery, shame and suffering to others, it will destroy a man's own character.

---

[4] William M. Lamers, Ph.D., and M. Edward Smith, M.A., *The Making of a Speaker* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1939), p. 59.

The preacher must not only hold the attention of the audience, he must also move them to action. He must get them to want to do what he suggests. The ultimate end of preaching is the spiritual good of souls, which means that a sermon aims not merely at imparting intellectual enlightenment, but at leading men to virtue and holiness. The preacher who thinks that he can do this by the employment of reason alone or by simply *telling* his hearers to do something is in for a great disappointment. People are moved or deterred from action only by some personal good to be gained or by some evil to be avoided. In other words, he who hopes to move his auditors must touch off the emotions or driving forces of human nature. This subject of the appeal to the emotions has been treated by Dr. Edmond D. Benard in a series of articles in the February, March, and April, 1944, issues of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*. For a clear, scholarly, and practical treatment of this important subject, I refer the reader to his articles.

The audience factor should also influence the preacher in his choice of words. He should present his thoughts in language that is readily understood by his auditors. He should employ words that are familiar to his listeners, words that come within the range of their vocabulary. He should bear in mind the fact that if his listeners do not understand a word they have not the opportunity that the reader has of consulting a dictionary.

In a comparatively recent book on public speaking there is cited the actual case of a priest who began his sermon to an average Sunday morning congregation in a not-too-select neighborhood in the following manner: "The more we excogitate upon the ultimate ends of our existence the more we are convinced that it can find its solution neither in the mute indifference of a stoicism or in the hedonistic escape of epicureanism."[5]

The author of the above quotation was certainly thinking more of his sermon than of his audience. What chance would the average housewife or laboring man have of understanding such pedantic and academic language? As far as conveying ideas was concerned, the priest might as well have spoken Chinese. It is well to remember that words which may be familiar to the preacher may be entirely foreign to the audience. If technical words are used, they should be defined.

---

[5] Lamers and Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

The preacher should also strive to select words which will conjure up pictures in the imagination. As we stated before, the best route to the intellect and will of the listeners is through the imagination.

The style employed by the preacher should be simple. So called "fine writing" should be avoided. The sentences should not be too long. Sentences with a great number of phrases and clauses are difficult for the listener to follow. Short sentences are much easier to deliver and make for better audience contact. The preacher should naturally employ a more direct style than the essay writer. The employment of the second person helps to give directness.

If the preacher should consider his audience before and during the actual composition of his sermon, how much more is this necessary when he ascends the pulpit to deliver his message. It seems almost like belaboring the obvious to state that the preacher should think of his audience during the actual delivery of his sermon. Yet observation clearly shows that many priests with well-constructed and well-written sermons fail to put their message across because they ignore their audience in the actual presentation of their sermon. You have all heard preachers who seemed to be talking to themselves; who seemed to be unconscious of an audience. Their talks sounded like memorized orations and lacked the directness, varied inflections and animation of communicative speech. They manifested very little interest in their audience and their audience in turn manifested very little interest in them.

Realizing that the purpose of a sermon is to enlighten people and to persuade them to Christian living, the preacher should make every effort to reach its audience. He must endeavor to "find their wave length"; for effective preaching depends upon audience contact. The effective preacher immediately tries to set up friendly relations with his audience. He indicates by his tone of voice, by looking directly at the audience, that he is interested in them and that he is happy at having the opportunity of addressing them. He uses a conversational mode of address, talking to the audience, not at them. He thinks at all times of his audience as individuals, with whom he must communicate, and whose attention and interest he must hold constantly. He does not think of himself as performing or giving a sermon or showing his power of oratory. He concentrates all the energies of his mind and body on the task of communication.[6]

To acquire the sense of communicativeness, the preacher must develop a consciousness that he is in the pulpit to talk to people. He should communicate his message not only by means of words but by posture, facial expression, gesture, and tone of voice.

Preaching is fundamentally *communication*. For successful communication, the preacher must never for a moment forget his audience. The audience factor should be uppermost in his mind in selecting a subject and determining his purpose, in arranging the matter of the sermon, in wording the sermon, in the actual delivery of the sermon. The preacher who gives due consideration to his audience is on the avenue to effective preaching. The preacher who ignores his audience will never be successful.

A perusal of the New Testament will clearly show how much consideration the greatest preacher of all times, Jesus Christ, gave to His audience. How skillfully He adapted His sermon to the intellectual level of His auditors. How adroitly He maintained interest by the use of the familiar, by the employment of graphic, concrete language, by resorting to the element of suspense in His parables. How effectively did He move His hearers to action by appealing to the impelling motives of love, fear, hope of reward, etc.

The preacher who hopes to be effective will do well to study and imitate the technique of his Master. If he does this, he will give due consideration to his audience.

Holy Cross Seminary,
Dunkirk, N. Y.

LUKE MISSETT, C.P.

---

[6] Cf. William P. Sanford and William H. Yeager, *Principles of Effective Speaking* (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1937), pp. 234–37.

PAPAL DOCUMENTS OF 1942

CHRISTMAS MESSAGE OF 1942

In this third installment of the series summarily reviewing documents issued by the Holy See during the years 1940–43, the leading position must be accorded to the message delivered by our Holy Father at Christmas, 1942.[1] In contrast with the message of the previous Christmas, which set forth the principles requisite for the establishment of an international order based on God's law, His Holiness in the message of 1942 declares the fundamental laws on which the internal order within each State must be founded, if peace is to endure. He points to the two primary elements regulating social life: living together in order and living together in tranquillity. As to the first, it is affirmed that disorder can be overcome only by the assertion of correct ideas about society. It must be recognized that God is the First Cause and the ultimate foundation of individual and social life, and that society itself is an imperfect image of life in God, enjoying a moral authority superior to temporal change, though its purpose is the development and perfecting of the human person.

It is declared further that social life needs the juridical order to support it,—not to dominate it, but to lead all individual energies to perfection in peaceful competition. The juridical order is responsible to God for its exercise of this prerogative, a responsibility which can not be escaped by postulates divorcing law from morality, by attributing a juridical imperative to race, or by exalting State absolutism.

As a first point, the rights and the dignity of the human person are emphasized. As a second point in the program for internal peace, the need for a defense of social unity is affirmed. True social unity is held to be that which exists not in a herd or mass of human beings fit only to be lorded over by their masters, but in the co-operation of the various classes and professions for the promotion of culture and religion. Social unity is built on the family, which must therefore be reinstated in its proper position in society. The indissolubility of the marriage bond must be defended. Provision must be made for proper housing conditions and for leisure to permit the wage-earner time to spend with his children. Above all, schools are not to corrupt in the child's soul the principles of right living learned at home.

---

[1] Cf. Guido Gonella, *A World to Reconstruct*, translated by Rev. T. Lincoln Bouscaren, S.J., (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1944), pp. 302 ff. *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* (*AAS*), XXXV (1943), 9.

The third point stresses the need for proper appreciation of the dignity of labor and lists among the elements needing recognition the claim to a just family wage, to a moderate interest in private property, to means adequate to the higher education of talented children, and to a share in the promotion of the social spirit in its proper sphere.

The fourth point insists on the necessity of rehabilitating the juridical order, which must be grounded on clearly defined law, not subject to dislocation by appeals to popular sentiment or utilitarianism, but responsible to God in its protection of liberty, property, honor, progress and health. The fifth and final point is the logical and juridical corollary of the fourth: the indispensability of the prevalence of the Christian concept of the State.

ST. ALBERT, PATRON OF THE NATURAL SCIENCES

In the direction of re-establishing the proper place of science in society, our Holy Father issued an Apostolic Letter on December 16, 1941,[2] declaring St. Albert the Great to be the patron of the natural sciences, and on March 7, 1942,[3] he wrote to the Master General of the Friars Preachers, dealing formally with this action and referring to the position enjoyed by St. Thomas Aquinas as patron of all schools

SILVER EPISCOPAL JUBILEE OF THE SUPREME PONTIFF

On May 13, 1942, our Holy Father observed the silver jubilee of his consecration as archbishop. He celebrated the anniversary Mass in St. Peter's Basilica, and afterwards directed a forty-five minute appeal by radio for the world to conclude peace on principles of justice and moderation.[4] The next day, the Feast of the Ascension, his sermon further adverted to the happy occasion.[5] To mark the consolation he experienced from the felicitations extended to him by the faithful, the clergy, and the hierarchy, he granted by a *Motu proprio* of May 12, 1942,[6] the favor of the privileged altar to priests throughout the world, effective from May 13, 1942, to May 13, 1943, later extended to June 29, 1943.[7] On June 10, 1942,[8] the Sacred Penitentiary solved a doubt

[2] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 89; cf. *The Jurist*, II (1942), 391.

[3] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 96.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 154.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 167.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 153; cf. *The American Ecclesiastical Review* (*AER*), CVII (1942), 355.

[7] *AAS*, XXXV (1943), 158.

[8] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 210; cf. *AER*, CVII (1942), 356; *The Jurist*, II (1942), 398.

concerning the use of this faculty. Under the explanation as rendered in that reply, in the celebration of every Mass a plenary indulgence was applicable to one soul in Purgatory, independent of the application of the Mass itself.[9]

To express his gratitude for the spiritual celebration of his jubilee and to manifest his solicitude for the whole body of the faithful, our Holy Father granted through a decree of the Sacred Penitentiary (July 20, 1942) an extension of the faculties of bishops to grant indulgences.[10] Under that decree, bishops are empowered to give the papal blessing, with a plenary indulgence attached, three times a year, instead of twice, as permitted by Canon 914. The other prelates mentioned in Canon 914 are empowered to give the blessing twice annually instead of once. Moreover, Cardinals are empowered to grant indulgences of three hundred days, instead of two hundred days, as permitted by Canon 239, §1, 24°; archbishops, of two hundred days instead of one hundred, as permitted by Canon 274, 2°; and bishops, of one hundred days instead of fifty days, as permitted under Canon 349, §2, 2°. In the same spirit and on the same day, the Sacred Penitentiary issued a decree[11] in which the indulgence granted those who submit themselves to be touched by the penitential rod was increased to three hundred days (seven years, if the rod is in the hands of the Cardinal *Maior Penitentiarius* during Holy Week).

INSTITUTE FOR WORKS OF RELIGION AND PIETY

By a chirograph of June 27, 1942, our Holy Father established the Institute for Works of Religion and Piety.[12]

PROVINCE OF DENVER

By two constitutions our Holy Father divided the territory of the Province of Denver from that of Dubuque and Santa Fe,[13] assigning to it as suffragans the Dioceses of Cheyenne and Pueblo, the latter Diocese coming into existence under one of the constitutions.[14]

---

[9] The decree cited the declaration of the Sacred Penitentiary of March 8, 1929. *AAS*, XXI (1929), 168.

[10] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 240; cf. *The Jurist*, III (1943), 157.

[11] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 239; cf. *The Jurist*, III (1943), 156.

[12] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 218.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 192.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 190.

PATRONESS FOR THE MILITARY VICARIATE

By an apostolic letter, our Holy Father on May 8, 1942, designated our Blessed Mother under the title of her Immaculate Conception as Patroness of the Military Vicariate of the United States.[15]

LETTERS OF FELICITATION

Letters of congratulation were sent by our Holy Father on the occasion of anniversaries to two Cardinals, to a religious society and to a college. On November 21, 1941, His Eminence, Cardinal Adolf Bertram was addressed on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of his elevation to the Cardinalate;[16] on September 2, 1941, His Eminence, Cardinal Domenico Iorio, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood;[17] on February 28, 1942, the Society of St. Sulpice, on the third centenary of its establishment;[18] and on March 29, 1942, the Spanish College in Rome, on the fiftieth anniversary of its establishment.[19]

PRAYERS FOR PEACE IN MAY

A letter sent by His Holiness to His Eminence, Cardinal Maglione, Secretary of State, on April 15, 1942, requested that the faithful, especially the youth, be invited to be diligent during the month of May in offering prayers for the coming of peace.[20]

LETTERS FROM THE MOST REVEREND APOSTOLIC DELEGATE

During 1942 three letters were sent by the Most Reverend Apostolic Delegate to the bishops of the United States notifying them of matters communicated to him by the Holy See. On January 1, he wrote stating that the Cardinal Secretary of State had directed him to inform them that communication with the Holy See was to be made through the Apostolic Delegation and that conditions necessary for the use of Canon 81 were not verified by the state of war.[21] On January 2,[22] he communicated to them the indult by which our Holy Father empowers the hierarchy to permit the faithful of their respective dioceses when engaged in defense work and obliged to work after midnight, to receive Holy Communion after observing only four hours of fast from food and one from liquid, but with the obligation of abstaining from alcoholic liquids from midnight, the privilege to be used always in such a way as to preclude scandal. These were the conditions prescribed for the reception of Holy Communion by the military personnel at Mass celebrated in the afternoon for their benefit when it was impossible for them to attend Mass in the morning, under a special faculty granted for the duration of the war to the Most Reverend Military Vicar of the armed forces of the United States by the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments (April 10, 1942).[23] The terms of the faculty further prescribed that precaution should be taken against the dangers of profanation and irreverence. The time limit for the celebration of Mass under this concession was seven-thirty in the evening. Special rescripts permitting the celebration of Mass in the afternoon for the benefit of defense workers were granted by the Sacred Congregation of Rites to the Dioceses of Richmond and Pueblo.[24]

---

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 221.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 93.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 34.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 94.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 124.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 125.

[21] *The Jurist*, II (1942), 182; Bouscaren, *The Canon Law Digest*, II (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1943), p. 44.

[22] *The Jurist*, II (1942), 181; Bouscaren, p. 215.

The third communication issued by the Most Reverend Apostolic Delegate referred to the petitions for faculties and indults concerning indulgences sent to the Sacred Penitentiary with the commendation of the respective Ordinaries, and suggested that in the future commendatory letters be granted only when special reasons militate in favor of the petition and that these reasons are to be expressed in the petition.

FACULTIES OF THE MOST REVEREND APOSTOLIC DELEGATE

The Apostolic Signatura on July 30, 1942,[25] granted the Most Reverend Apostolic Delegate the faculty of designating Metropolitan regional courts of third instance in matrimonial cases, with the understanding that in each case the source of his authority be indicated and that the *defensor* and the parties retain their right of appeal to the S. R. Rota in third instance and are entitled to take recourse to the Apostolic Signatura against the sentence rendered by the regional court of third instance.

On July 17,[26] the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments granted the Most Reverend Apostolic Delegate the authority to grant to

---

[23] Bouscaren, p. 620; *The Jurist*, II (1942), 399.

[24] Cf. *The Jurist*, III (1943), 619.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 154; *AER*, CVII (1942), 354.

[26] *The Jurist*, III (1943), 154; *AER*, CVII (1942), 353; Bouscaren, p. 462.

Ordinaries the faculty of instructing the procedure required in petitions for a dispensation *super matrimonio rato et non consummato.* Later the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office granted him a similar faculty in cases subject to it, under the same terms as the rescript of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments, i.e., for cases involving a mixed marriage but not cases in which the non-Catholic party would be a petitioner. The Holy Office has exclusive competence over this procedure when one of the parties to the marriage is a non-Catholic, as it asserted in its decision of January 27, 1928;[27] although the *Regulae servandae* established in the decree, *Catholica Doctrina* (May 7, 1923),[28] of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments affords the guiding norms for processes even in such cases.

FAITH AND MORALS

In accordance with its function of guarding the deposit of faith and of being vigilant for the preservation of the laws of morality, the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office issued on June 12, 1942, a decree laying down safeguards to be observed by ecclesiastical courts in cases involving impotence or a petition for a dispensation *super matrimonio rato et non consummato.*[29] That decree provides for the omission of the physical examination of the woman in the cases specified in the *Regulae servandae* for the procedure in cases "*super rato*": viz., if the impossibility of consummation or the lack of virginity is apparent. It adds two other cases: when there is *plenissima probatio* without the bodily inspection and when the bodily inspection of the man suffices. Male physicians are to be employed for the examination of the woman only when it is impossible to have skilled female physicians for this task; and when chosen they must be above reproach. They are to be admonished by the court as to the obligations of observing Christian modesty and they are to conduct the examination in the presence of a woman witness. If the woman refuses to permit the examination, she can only be told of the juridical consequences of her refusal. The women physicians who conducted the examination are to be examined by the court in the presence of a skilled physician who will be able to ask opportune questions. He it is, also, who should interrogate the woman when she is examined before the court, using the questions drawn up according to the requirements of the *Regulae servandae*.

---

[27] *AAS*, XX (1928), 75.

[28] *AAS*, XV (1923), 389.

[29] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 200; cf. *The Jurist*, II (1942), 395 ff.

In a decree of April 17, 1942, the Holy Office exhorted Ordinaries to prevent the bizarre from creeping into books and leaflets of piety by appointing learned and prudent men to subject them to a previous examination not only as to the purity of the doctrine contained in them but also as to their conformity with the demands of dignified worship as laid down in the Decree of the Holy Office of May 26, 1937, *De novis cultus seu devotionis formis non introducendis.*[30]

In a decree of May 26, 1942, the same Sacred Congregation admonished Ordinaries and religious superiors to forbid clerics and religious, in conformity with Canons 138 and 139, §1 (denying to clerics whatever is unbecoming their state), attendance at seances involving the practice of radioesthesia, viz., the attempt at divining future circumstances and events. The decree specifically notes that it prescinds from judgment upon the scientific aspects of the problem.[31]

MARRIAGE

On January 16, 1942, the Holy Office replied to a question regarding the ante-nuptial agreements guaranteeing the Catholic baptism and education of offspring that the guarantee concerned only future offspring, though it added its *mens* that the parties were to be admonished as to their grave obligation arising under the divine law of providing Catholic education also for the offspring already born.[32]

The Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, in a communication to the Most Reverend Apostolic Delegate on July 9, 1942, answered a question concerning the obligation of baptized Catholics born of a non-Catholic and reared from infancy outside the Church, to observe the canonical form of marriage when marriage is entered into by them with a member of an Oriental Rite who is bound by no form for the validity of the marriage. The reply was that there is no obligation under these circumstances.[33]

The Pontifical Commission, on January 31, 1942, issued three authentic replies, one of which declared that the vicar co-operator is not competent, by reason of his office under Canon 476, §6, to assist validly at marriages.[34] The Commission issued three other replies on July 27, 1942, one of which stated that when the Ordinary is competent to issue a dispensation under Canon 81, he may exercise that power even when there is no question involved of preparations completed for the marriage ceremony, as required in Canon 1045.[35] Another reply of the same date asserted that under Canon 1971, §1, 1°, and the response of July 17, 1933,[36] only that party to the marriage who has been the *causa directa et dolosa* of the invalidity or of the impediment causing the invalidity is to be considered as estopped from attacking the validity of the marriage.[37]

---

[30] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 149; cf. *The Jurist*, II (1942), 307, 394.

[31] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 148; cf. *The Jurist*, II (1942), 307, 394.

[32] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 22; cf. *The Jurist*, II (1942), 185, 389.

[33] Cf. *The Jurist*, II (1942), 339; Bouscaren, p. 338.

[34] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 50; cf. *The Jurist*, II (1942), 390.

RELIGIOUS

In each set of the replies of the Commission just noted, there was one affecting religious. In the first, it was decided that under Canon 1230, §5, it is the chaplain and not the pastor who enjoys burial rights in the case of nuns of solemn vows not exempt from the jurisdiction of the local Ordinary according to Canon 615. In the second set of replies, an interpretation was given of the words of Canon 641, §2: *Episcopus potest probationis tempus prorogare*, and the sense of the words was held to be that the bishop may *tacitly* extend the term of trial of a religious whom he is testing prior to incardination.

On May 11, 1942,[38] the Sacred Congregation of Religious informed the General of the Society of Jesus that the decree issued jointly by that Sacred Congregation with the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Studies on July 25, 1941,[39] was not meant to apply to those who left a seminary or a college to enter a religious institute. The decree of 1941 had required permission from the respective Sacred Congregations when those who had been attached to a religious community desired to enter a seminary and when those who had left a seminary desired to enter a religious community.

INDULGENCES

Reference has already been made to the indulgence of the privileged altar granted by our Holy Father on the occasion of his silver episcopal jubilee, as well as to the decree of the Sacred Penitentiary of July 20, 1942, issued in connection with that joyous anniversary and increasing the powers of those privileged to confer indulgences and the number of occasions on which they might be conferred, as well as the extent of

[35] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 241; cf. *The Jurist*, III (1943), 155.

[36] *AAS*, XXV (1933), 345.

[37] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 241; cf. *The Jurist*, III (1943), 156, 401 ff.

[38] Cf. Bouscaren, p. 166.

[39] *AAS*, XXXIII (1941), 371; cf. *The Jurist*, II (1942), 61, 380.

the indulgences themselves. Besides this decree, the Sacred Penitentiary, on December 23, 1942, issued a decree granting a plenary indulgence to those who, on the occasion of an air raid, recite in any language the aspiration, "My Jesus, mercy."[40]

On May 19, 1942, the Sacred Penitentiary granted the Most Reverend Military Delegate the power of erecting the Way of the Cross either personally or through others, and of attaching the usual indulgences, in chapels used by Catholics and non-Catholics alike.[41]

On September 22, 1942, the Sacred Penitentiary warned that crucifixes blessed with the privilege of a plenary indulgence to be gained by kissing them, carry the privilege of that indulgence not *toties quoties* but only *in articulo mortis*.[42]

DIVINE WORSHIP

Foremost among the documents concerned with divine worship emanating from the Sacred Congregation of Rites in 1942 was the new Mass, the *Commune Unius aut Plurium Pontificum*, approved with additions and variations in the Missal and Breviary (new lessons for the third nocturn) for use in the case of Popes who were Martyrs or Confessors and for whose feasts no proper has been provided (January 9, 1942).[43]

On March 13, 1942, the Sacred Congregation of Rites issued an indult, referring to previous decrees nn. 4332 (June 24, 1914) and 4334 covering the question of the use of electricity for the tabernacle light, in which it states that following the concession made in the latter decree it commits to the prudence of Ordinaries, in places in which olive oil or beeswax can be obtained only at great inconvenience and expense, to permit the use of other oils, vegetable if possible, and as a last resort even the use of electric light. In the same indult it is also committed to the prudence of Ordinaries to reduce the number of candles made of beeswax prescribed for various services and to supply the deficiency with candles made of other materials or even with electric light.[44]

---

[40] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 382; cf. *The Jurist*, III (1943), 501.

[41] Bouscaren, p. 627; cf. *The Jurist*, II (1942), 400.

[42] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 303; cf. *The Jurist*, III (1943), 331. Reference is made to the decree of the Holy Office of June 10, 1914, *AAS*, VI (1914), 347, and to the decree of the Sacred Penitentiary of June 23, 1929, *AAS*, XXI (1929), 510.

[43] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 111; *AER*, CVII (1942), 357; *The Jurist*, II (1942), 392.

[44] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 112; cf. *The Jurist*, II (1942), 393.

On May 1, 1942,[45] the Sacred Congregation issued a decree solving problems arising out of requests for funeral services on Sundays and holy days of obligation. It exhorts Ordinaries to care for the proper observance of the prescriptions of the Roman Ritual[46] and the new Rubrics of the Missal.[47] It notes that a Mass is a funeral Mass only if the corpse is at least morally present, and this moral presence is not possible beyond the second day after death.[48] This Mass is to be a chanted Mass, except in the case of the poor, and the practice of reading a low Mass is reprobated. If the celebration of the funeral Mass is prevented by the rubrical laws on a proper day, it may be celebrated on the first day on which those laws permit it. On the other hand, if the celebration of the Mass is prevented by other than rubrical obstacles, and can occur only on some later opportune day, though the Mass is privileged, it is not a funeral Mass and can not be celebrated on Sundays or holy days of obligation, though the absolution *ad tumulum* may be given following the Mass of the day, except on those Sundays and feasts on which the funeral Mass in the presence of the corpse is forbidden.

BEATIFICATION AND CANONIZATION

Commissions were signed for the introduction of the following causes: November 28, 1941, Maria a Divino Corde (in the world, Maria Droste zu Vischering), of the Congregation of the Sisters of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd;[49] February 13, 1942, Sister Mary Francis of the Five Wounds (in the world, Margaret Sinclair), of the Poor Clares;[50] February 13, 1942, Father Bernard Mary of Jesus, Superior General of the Passionists;[51] July 10, 1942, Father Arnold Janssen, Founder of the Society of the Divine Word, of the Missionary Servants of the Holy Ghost, and of the Servants of the Holy Ghost of Perpetual Adoration;[52] December 6, 1942, Jean Frances of the Visitation of Mary (in the world, Anna Michelotti), Foundress of the Little Servants of the Sacred Heart of Jesus of the Sick Poor;[53]

---

[45] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 205; cf. *The Jurist*, II (1942), 397.
[46] Tit. VI, cap. I, n. 8; and cap. III n. 18.
[47] Tit. III, n. 4.
[48] Cf. S.R.C., nn. 3755, §2, and 3767, ad XXVI.
[49] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 41.
[50] *Ibid.*, p. 207.
[51] *Ibid.*, p. 172.
[52] *AAS*, XXXV (1943), 27.
[53] *Ibid.*, p. 86.

and also December 6, 1942, Brother Joseph Giraldi, of the Order of Friar's Minor.[54] On December 6, 1942, also, provision was made for the resumption of the cause of Maria Gulielma Aemilia de Rodat, Foundress of the Congregation of the Holy Family.[55]

Favorable judgments as to the existence of two miracles were passed in the following causes: November 16, 1941, Venerable Jean Delanoue, Foundress of the Congregation of St. Ann of Providence;[56] March 15, 1942, Venerable Contardo Ferrini, Professor of the University of Pavia,[57] and January 11, 1942, Blessed Louis M. Grignion à Montfort, Confessor, Founder of the Missionary Priests of the Society of Mary and of the Daughters of Wisdom.[58]

PROCEDURE

The Pontifical Commission in its responses of January 31, 1942, already noted, declared that the *acta causae* which are to be transmitted to the court of appeal under Canon 1890 includes all the judicial acts.[59]

On October 1, 1942, our Holy Father delivered an allocution to the Auditors of the Roman Rota.[60] He dealt with the moral certainty required in judicial processes. Absolute certainty is not required, but probability does not suffice, though in the latter case the law provides the judge with obligatory rules in which presumptions and favors of law are controlling elements. Moral certainty is not a mere adding of probabilities. It is rather based on a process in which it is recognized that the simultaneous presence of various proofs points to a common source. Objective certainty based on investigation and proof is requisite (not mere subjective certainty based on subjective opinion, much less on credulity, inexperience, or lack of reflection). Rules of procedure are not ends in themselves but they must be observed conscientiously, since they aim at the production of the proofs required.

BIBLICAL DEGREES

On July 2, 1942, the Biblical Commission issued a response as to the formalities involved in the granting of Biblical degrees, indicating that the baccalaureate is conferred after the successful completion of the oral examination in Hebrew and Greek; the licentiate, after the other examinations.[61]

---

[54] *Ibid.*, p. 83.

[55] *Ibid.*, p. 82.

[56] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 39, 46.

[57] *Ibid.*, p. 174.

[58] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

[59] *Ibid.*, p. 50; cf. *The Jurist* II (1942), 390.

[60] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 338; cf. *The Jurist*, III (1943), 500.

PETITIONS TO THE APOSTOLIC DATARY FOR APPOINTMENTS TO BENEFICES

On January 1, 1942, the Apostolic Datary issued an instruction on the rules to be followed by Ordinaries in applying to the Holy Father for appointments to reserved benefices. The petitions are to be written in Latin and signed by the Ordinary, setting forth all the qualities and characteristics of the benefice, including the usual manner in which appointment to it is made; indicating the date on which and the manner in which the benefice became vacant; specifying the amount and certainty of the income; describing the qualities of the candidates, explaining whether or not they possess any other benefice, and if they do, setting forth its nature, and qualifying religious as such, with a full account of their history in the community to which they belong or belonged; including the names of *all* candidates who have applied for the appointment, and if none have applied, containing at least the names of three of the more worthy of appointment, and indicating which is the best qualified.[62]

INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF VICARIATES

On June 21, 1942, the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith issued an instruction indicating the points of information which must be sent to it preliminary to the establishment of Vicariates, Prefectures, or Dioceses. The history of the missions in the proper territory is of prime importance, as well as a geographical description of the territory to be comprised within the new unit, fortified with maps following political or ethnographical subdivisions. The number, loyalty and geographical distribution of the people is to be indicated; as well as complete information on the available number of missionaries, catechists, and religious communities, their means of support, the facilities for their clerical training, and the location and condition of the Ordinary's house. The existence of institutions of charity and education is to be noted, with a thorough sociological and political outline of the place.[63]

---

[61] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 232.

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 113; cf. *The Jurist*, II (1942), 400.

[63] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 347; cf. *The Jurist*, III (1943), 618.

CATHEDRAL CHAPTERS

The Sacred Congregation of the Council solved three cases touching Cathedral Chapters. On July 13, 1941, it decided that canons who were also vicars co-operators of the parish, as well as all vicars in filial churches of the parish, had funeral rights superior to those of the religious of Franciscan and Capuchin monasteries in the respective territory.[64] On February 22, 1942, the Sacred Congregation declared that two members of the Chapter who were dispensed from choir by an indult of the Sacred Congregation in observance of their jubilee, were entitled to the *distributiones inter praesentes* under Canon 422, §2. In the course of its animadversions, the Sacred Congregation indicated that they were entitled also to the *distributiones quotidianae*.[65] On February 23, 1942, the Sacred Congregation declared that a canon who is absent from choir in order to discharge the duties of synodal judge is entitled under Canon 420, §1, 14°, to the *distributiones quotidianae* even though he may receive a stipend for his work as judge.[66] Reference is made to a reply of the Pontifical Commission of November 24, 1920,[67] holding that a canon who received a stipend for lectures delivered in a seminary was included among those entitled to the income of the prebend under Canon 421, §1, 1°. It is now stated that this reply must be understood in the sense of the present decision and that the professor is entitled also to the *distributiones quotidianae*.

RESIGNATION OF CANDIDATE FOR RESERVED BENEFICE

On December 20, 1942, the Sacred Congregation of the Council issued a resolution declaring that when a candidate for a benefice reserved to the Holy See resigns a benefice already possessed prior to the submission of his name to the Holy See, appointment to the resigned benefice is nevertheless also reserved to the Holy See under Canon 1435, §1, 4°.[68]

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

JEROME D. HANNAN.

---

[64] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 101.

[65] *AAS*, XXXV (1943), 182; cf. *The Jurist*, IV (1944), 163.

[66] *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 299; cf. *The Jurist*, III (1943), 331.

[67] *AAS*, XII (1920), 573.

[68] *AAS*, XXXV (1943), 148; cf. *AER*, CXI (1944), 64; *The Jurist*, IV (1944), 166.

AN EFFECTIVE DEMONSTRATION FROM THE MARKS OF THE CHURCH

Every priest is necessarily a teacher. One of the most important matters he has to teach to his own people, and to those outside the fold, is the truth that ours is the true Church of Jesus Christ. The implements by which he proves this conclusion are what we call the marks, the signs, or the notes of the Catholic Church. Hence a practical knowledge of these marks is of tremendous importance to any priest. It can contribute in a great measure to the success of his teaching mission.

It so happens that theological science recognizes, not one, but three distinct procedures which may be used in demonstrating the truth of the Catholic Church. The Rev. Dr. Gustave Thils, by far the best modern writer on the notes of the Church, speaks of them technically as the *via empirica*, the *via historica*, and the *via notarum* properly so-called.[1] Any presentation of the essential truth of the Catholic Church will be clearer and more effective if all these three ways are understood.

Among modern manuals of sacred theology, that of Tanquerey-Bord prefers the *via empirica* to the *via notarum*, considering the former much more effective than the latter.[2] Reginald Schultes, on the contrary, prefers the *via notarum*.[3] Yet, despite the teachings of these authorities, it would be a serious mistake to suppose that the three methods under discussion really compete with one another at all. Actually, each has its own immediate conclusion. Each can and should be used, accurately and clearly, to accomplish one definite objective. Certainly no one would fall into any grave theological error if he were to substitute one of these procedures for the other. But the man who confuses the three necessarily weakens the force of his own teaching.

---

[1] *Les Notes de l'Eglise dans l'Apologêtique Catholique depuis la Reform* (Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1937), pp. ix ff.

[2] *Synopsis Theologiae Dogmaticae Fundamentalis*, Auctore Ad. Tanquerey, editio vicesima quarta quam penitus recognovit et de novo redegit J. B. Bord (Paris, Tournai, Rome: Desclée et Socii, 1937), p. 516.

[3] *De Ecclesia Catholica Praelectiones Apologeticae*, Auctore P. Reginaldo-Maria Schultes, O.P., denuo editae cura P. Edmundi M. Prantner, O.P. (Paris; P. Lethielleux, 1931), pp. 155 ff.

THE CHURCH AS A MIRACLE OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

What Thils calls the *via empirica* involves the recognition of the Catholic Church as an *existent miracle of the social order.* It is the procedure outlined by the Vatican Council, in the Constitution *Dei Filius.*

> Moreover, the Church herself, by reason of her marvellous propagation, her eminent holiness and her unfailing fruitfulness in everything good, by reason of her catholic unity and her unconquered stability, is a kind of great and perpetual motive of credibility and an irrefutable witness of her own divine messengership.[4]

The *via empirica*, then, considers the Church fundamentally as a motive of credibility. It procedes by pointing out the various characteristics which mark this society as something which manifestly could not exist and act as it does and has done if it had to depend upon the natural forces of men for its being and activity. It insists upon the obvious fact that the Catholic Church is a reality utterly disproportionate to the natural social efforts of human beings.

The Church of God is not merely too big a thing to be explicable by and proportionate to the natural order of human energy. It is a *different kind of effect*, indicating the activity of a *different kind of cause.* The status of the Catholic Church as a miracle of the social order follows upon the manifest truth that the force which keeps it in existence and in operation is not one which has to use, and is thus dependent upon, the natural tendencies and laws of the created universe, but rather one which controls these laws and tendencies themselves. Other societies bear the indications of their origin from and dependence upon human beings, who are compelled to employ the natural forces inherent in human nature for the attainment of their own purposes. The Catholic Church shows itself to be an effect produced in the world by one upon whom these forces themselves depend.

We can understand this aspect of the Catholic Church much more clearly if we consider the case of a miracle of the physical order, and compare it with a somewhat similar effect produced naturally. When our Lord raised Lazarus from the dead, He performed an act which bears some superficial resemblance to that of a human physician, curing a patient of a terrible disease. But the effect produced by our Lord is not merely *greater* than that accomplished by the physician, it is something of *an altogether different sort.* The best physician in the world can only work in such a way that the natural physical forces of the human body can operate to bring about the corporeal well-being towards which they themselves tend. If some function is impeded, the physician acts to remove or render inoperative the impeding force. If some chemical has the natural power to stimulate a healthy function, the healer can avail himself of this force. Inevitably, however, the medical practitioner employs those currents of bodily energy which flow in such a direction as to bring a man from birth, through childhood and adolescence, to maturity, old age, and death.

---

[4] Sess. III, cap. 3. (*DB* 1794.)

In much the same way, the hydraulic engineer uses the water in a canal to obtain the maximum of energy for the turning of a dynamo. His effectiveness as an engineer depends upon the percentage of the available waterpower he is able to apply to the task he has at hand. If he manages to rig up a contrivance which will deliver, say, ten per cent more power than an existing installation, it will be only because he has managed to use the forces at his disposition more efficiently than did his predecessor. He can never affect the forces themselves. He can never deliver into his dynamo more power than that which the laws of nature allow this particular flow of water to deliver.

On the contrary, the operation of bringing Lazarus back to life, and that of sustaining the Catholic Church in being and in activity, manifestly involve an absolute independence of created forces and the laws of created nature. The current of energy which a creature can employ for the purpose of healing moves inevitably from birth to death. Subsequent forces move, inexorably also, from death to the corruption of the human body. They definitely and obviously do not move from corruption to life any more than the water which the engineer uses to turn his dynamo moves uphill. A real passage against the current of the laws governing created nature, and not merely an effect produced upon beings subject to these laws, is what we find in the raising of Lazarus, and in the sustaining of the Catholic Church. Such an operation can be produced only by a force which, far from depending upon these laws of created nature, has these very laws depending upon itself. A creature can be only an instrumental cause in producing an effect of this kind.

A very easy process of comparison will show how the Catholic Church's existence and activity run counter to the tendencies which govern the type of society which creatures are naturally competent to institute and preserve. The report of the religious census for 1936 (incidentally, one of the most effective instruments for Catholic apologetics available anywhere), lists and gives a somewhat detailed description of well over two hundred religious organizations now operating within the United States of America.[5] An examination of the groups described in this book shows at once that the Catholic Church is something utterly different from all the rest.

This visible society has spread in such a way as to be perfectly at home in America, and perfectly at home in every other part of the world. Its propagation certainly is not dependent upon the naturally available factors of racial or national solidarity, nor upon the power of politics and money, nor upon hatred, ignorance, and fanaticism. Its ineffable social holiness is manifest in the supreme prayer of the Mass, the expression of its corporate petition to God, and hence the manifestation of its purpose in this world. This prayer is its own. The Church is certainly not an imitation of any other religious society, and the tremendous good which it does in this and other lands is manifestly the result of its own inner intention, and not merely brought about to "steal the thunder" of some other group. Alone, in a world where doctrinal disunity is the rule among those who pay any attention to religious teaching, the Catholic Church insists upon definite and immutable dogmas of faith, commanding and maintaining a perfect unity. Where opposition tends to deflect and to change societies which are subject to it, the Catholic Church has weathered and is still sustaining opposition far more furious and profound than that which has been meted out to any other organization, and she remains peacefully constant in the midst of this strife.

The created social forces with which the Catholic Church comes in contact tend to crush or change or divide a society of this kind. Hence, the qualities by which she manifests her life and operation despite these forces mark this Church, here and now, as something which creatures could never be able to produce and sustain by their own unaided natural powers. As a visible society possessing these qualities, the Church is manifest as a miracle of the social order, an effect which only God is competent to produce in the world, a true motive of credibility.

A signature, in the world of men, is something which an individual man can produce and which cannot be exactly duplicated. Others can imitate or counterfeit this signature, but only the man to whom it belongs is competent to produce it genuinely. A man's signature, attached to a document of any kind, is evidence that the man to whom the signature belongs has made himself responsible for the content of that document.

---

[5] I have reference to the two-part second volume of *Religious Bodies: 1936* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1941).

Because it is an effect which only God can produce in the world, and because it is something visible or perceptible to man, a miracle of any kind constitutes a real signature of God. When it is attached to a definite teaching, it constitutes an unfailing indication that God Himself is responsible for that doctrine. The manifest miracle of the social order which is the visible Catholic Church is unquestionably attached to a body of doctrine. The Church is defined in function of a body of teaching which claims to be divine revelation. In establishing the Catholic Church as a social miracle, and in constituting it as His signature, God manifests the accuracy of the claim made in favor of the Church's dogma. He renders that dogma rationally credible as divine revelation, and the Church herself stands as one of the chief motives of credibility.

Basic in the deposit of that teaching which is rendered rationally credible through the social miracle which is the Catholic Church is the assertion that this same Church is the society in which our Lord wishes to have all His followers dwell, because it is the true Church of the promises. The *via empirica*, indicating the character of the Church as a motive of credibility, certifies this claim of divine revelation with reference to the Church itself. In this way it contributes to the teaching about the true Church of Jesus Christ.

THE HISTORICAL DEMONSTRATION

The *via historica*, on the other hand, serves primarily to show that the existent Catholic Church is really the visible religious society instituted by our Lord. It is important to note that a demonstration conducted along this line does not immediately and necessarily involve the use of those four qualities which, since the seventeenth century at least, have been known commonly as the "notes of the Church." The *via historica* has its own province and its own effectiveness, quite distinct from those of the *via notarum*.

The *via historica* points to the fact that the existent Catholic Church, living here and now under the direction of Pope Pius XII as Christ's Vicar on earth, is *numerically* identical with the Church within which the Fathers taught, and thus numerically identical with the religious society of our Lord's disciples which met, under the presidency of St. Peter, in the upper room at Jerusalem immediately after His

Ascension. Thus it indicates the origin of this Church, as a religious and visible society, from our Lord Himself. This is its primary and essential concern.

Strange as it may seem, the proof of the Church's origin, conducted along the lines of the *via historica*, encounters practically no opposition. The militant heresies since the Middle Ages have all been based more or less explicitly on the assumption that, at some time or another in its history, the visible Church which had once lived in apostolic fervor was corrupted and deflected from its pristine excellence. Thus, Moneta of Cremona informs us that the old *Cathari* ascribed the downfall of the original Christian society to no less a personage than Pope St. Sylvester.[6] The brilliant Thomas Stapleton remarked that the heretics of his day were unanimous in their teaching that the visible Church had fallen from its original purity, but that they showed a curious lack of uniformity in explaining about the time when this melancholy event had taken place.[7] Conjectures on the part of the sixteenth century Reformers placed the defection of the visible Church at any conceivable time between the first Christian Pentecost and the Council of Constance.

The heretics cited this imaginary corruption of the Church as the reason why they left it. But they never for a moment made a serious attempt to deny that the Church which they thought corrupt, and which they had abandoned, continued to exist. They acknowledged that this ancient society was none other than the Catholic Church, the Church of Rome. The very vehemence with which they attacked and persecuted the old Church showed their bitterness against it for what they considered its defection. They never attempted to claim that theirs was the visible society which had once included St. Peter and the rest of the apostles within its membership. Thus, amidst the confusion of Reformation ecclesiology these two truths remained unscathed: (1) that there had been an ancient and apostolic visible society of the Christians, and (2) that this same society continues to exist as the Catholic Church.

In the teaching offered today in ordinary Protestant circles these paramount facts are acknowledged. The most violently and pitifully anti-Catholic manual I have been able to find, a Protestant Sunday-school text reprinted last year, accepts them even in explaining the defection of the dissident Orientals. The author, vigorously contributing to what Mr. Chesterton called "the halo of hatred around the Church of God,"[8] thus explains the Eastern schism. "But now at last the Pope's insistent claim of being Lord of Christendom had become unbearable, and the East definitely separated itself."[9] It is perfectly clear that the writer of these lines imagines that the departure of the Greeks was justified, but even he does not hazard a denial that the original Church was, and continued to be, the society headed by the Bishop of Rome. The organization to which the dissident Orientals had belonged, and from which they withdrew, continued to exist without them.

---

[6] Cf., *Adversus Catharos et Valdenses Libri Quinque* (Rome, 1743), pp. 409 ff.

[7] *Principiorum Fidei Doctrinalium Demonstratio Methodica* (Paris, 1579), pp. 82 ff.

The youngsters who use this text learn that Martin Luther is "next to Jesus and Paul, the Greatest Man of all the ages," and that he "led the world in its break for Freedom from the most Despotic Institution in history."[10] Nowhere, however, is there any trace of an attempt to show that this "most Despotic Institution" was or is other than the same society of which Peter and Linus had once been rulers in the name and by the power of Christ. The unfortunate Luther's revolt was based, not on any denial that the old Church was actually the society in which the apostles had lived, but on grievances against this organization.

Today the most important link in a demonstration along the lines of the *via historica* is the part which deals with the actual founding of the Church by our Lord. The tendency among contemporary opponents of the Church is to admit the existence of a visible apostolic Church, but to play down the connection between this organization and our Lord. The first section of the Acts of the Apostles, showing that the group which met after the Ascension in Jerusalem under the leadership of St. Peter, and which received the Pentecostal Gift, was actually the gathering of the disciples, which corporately had been with Him during the entire course of His public life, is perfectly adapted to take care of objections from this quarter.

THE NOTES OF THE CHURCH

Even to the bitterest enemies of the Church, the immediate conclusion reached through the *via historica* is fairly obvious. There is no ascertainable serious effort to deny that the Church, the visible society to which the apostles belonged, exists here and now in the world as the Catholic Church. The foes of Catholicism, however, maintain that this visible society was never, at any time, the true Church of Jesus Christ in the full sense of the term. The true Church they recognize as the group with which our Lord promised to abide until the end of the world, the group to whom He promised the Gift of the Holy Ghost, the society to which all men must belong in order to be followers of Christ and to attain their eternal salvation. According to the Protestant theory, this true Church of the promises was from the outset an invisible society. Some said that it was the gathering of the just, others claimed that it was the society of the predestined. All agreed that the promises of Christ were made to such a body, and not to any definite visible society.

---

[8] These words are found in *The Everlasting Man* (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1943), p. 197.

[9] *Pocket Bible Handbook*, by Henry H. Halley (Chicago: Henry H. Halley, 1943), p. 525.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 538.

The heretics taught that the visible Church, even that of the apostles, existed only in order to embody this invisible true Church of Christ. It was at best a highly valuable, but always secondary adjunct to the Church of the just, or the Church of the predestined. It was essentially an organization within which the souls in the state of grace could find mutual edification in their efforts to live as members of the true and invisible Church. The visible Church existed only for the sake of the invisible.

It was likewise the contention of the heretics that, at a certain time of which they could not seem to be sure, the original visible Church became so corrupted that it was no longer adapted to the life of a man in the state of grace, to say nothing of those who were destined for heaven. Acting on this assumption, they considered it the duty, or at least the privilege, of the elect and the just to organize distinct and independent religious societies to serve as visible Churches and to care for their corporate supernatural needs. Any such organization was considered acceptable if it fulfilled two basic requirements, that is, if within such a society the word of God was taught sincerely and the sacraments properly administered.

These two conditions were the famous Protestant notes of the Church. The classical Catholic ecclesiologists, from the days of John Driedo, Peter Soto, and Thomas Stapleton, to our own time, reacted against this teaching in two distinct ways. First of all they set out to show that these Protestant notes were not really characteristics of an organization which our Lord wished His followers to enter. Secondly they proposed and stressed those qualities which, by the will of God, actually are the notes or signs of His true Church. In Catholic ecclesiology, then, the notes of the Church are considered primarily as signs attached to the visible Church, marking it unquestionably as the organization within which Christ wills that His followers or disciples should dwell. The notes are not meant to show immediately that the Catholic Church is the visible religious society instituted by Christ. They are manifest and visible signs, inherent in the Catholic Church, and indicating this society as the true Church of the promises, the group outside of which there is no salvation. They are used to demonstrate that the visible Catholic Church, and not some amorphous and invisible group, constitutes the real *ecclesia sanctorum*.

No Catholic ecclesiologist seemed to approach the scholarly and forthright Thomas Stapleton as an effective debunker of the Protestant notes of the Church. The great Englishman observed that the principal preoccupation of the heretical ecclesiologists of his day was an effort to prove that the original visible Church alone among the religious organizations could not be considered as fulfilling the rather meager requirements for an acceptable visible Church according to their formula. Stapleton derived a certain bitter amusement from the spectacle provided by the attempts of the Reformers of his day to show how societies as diverse as those of the Lutherans and the Anabaptists could both possess the Protestant "notes of the Church" while the society instituted by our Lord Himself was supposed to be rejected.[11]

The Reforming ecclesiologists shied away from this difficulty by distinguishing between two different grades of revealed truth. The "sincerity" they demanded in the preaching of revealed doctrine within an acceptable visible religious society involved accuracy only with reference to doctrines of the Christian center,—"fundamental" teachings, as they called them. The heretics professed to believe that, once these central teachings of Christianity were taken care of, error about secondary or peripheral doctrines was of little account. Stapleton took the trouble to point out that, in the status of Protestantism in his own time, the doctrinal content of this Christian center of "fundamental" truths was hardly impressive.

The Catholic doctors fought against these heretical "notes of the Church" in a positive way by offering the real characteristics of the Church of the promises. They adopted the teachings of the scholastic theologians who had gone before them in defending God's Church against the attacks of its enemies. The doctrine of the Catholic notes of the Church had existed in the traditional ecclesiology long before the Lutheran revolt. Earlier theologians too had been faced with the problem of proving that the visible Catholic Church was the true Church of Jesus Christ, the society within which our Lord wills that His disciples should live.

---

[11] Cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 20 ff.

Thus Moneta of Cremona had taught that a man could prove that the Roman Church is really the "*congregatio fidelium*" by examining its faith and its works, and by contrasting these with the faith and works of the heretical societies of his own time. Moneta's principal concern was with the examination of faith. He used the teaching of Scripture as a norm, and showed that only the Catholic position was consonant with the inspired writings.[12] The purpose of his demonstration was to show that the kingdom of God on earth, a society which had been in existence since the first days of the human race, was now identified with the religious organization which was subject to the Bishop of Rome.

Another Dominican of the thirteenth century, St. Thomas Aquinas, approached the problem from another angle. He named four "*conditiones*" of the Church, and indicated that each one of these could be found in the true Church, and not in any heretical organization. He treated each point in such a way as to show, not the difference between the Catholic Church and any one heretical sect, *but between the Catholic Church and the heretical position as such.*

We can see this aspect of St. Thomas' teaching on the notes of the Church in his treatment of the note of unity. According to the Angelic and Common Doctor, "although the heretics have invented various sects, they still do not belong to the Church, because they are divided into many parts, while the Church is one."[13] St. Thomas was perfectly aware that every individual heretical denomination, though it may be an offshoot or subdivision of another, is, as it stands, definitely one visible organization. But, what is more important, he realized very well *that the individual heretic's claim to be a follower of Christ could not be based on membership in any single visible religious organization.* The appeal of the heretics of his time, and for that matter of our own, is precisely to a *multitude* of visible organizations, which are supposed, in one way or another, to embody the true and invisible Church of Jesus Christ. No one of these heretical organizations attempts to claim that it was actually founded or commanded by our Lord. All that any of them can pretend to be is a voluntary gathering of persons who are convinced of their own spiritual excellence as followers of Christ.

---

[12] Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 390.

[13] *Expositio super Symbolo Apostolorum, scilicet Credo in Deum,* in the Mandonnet edition of the *Opuscula Omnia* (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1927), IV, 378.

The fact that a man enters a Church like that of the Waldensians of the thirteenth century, or the Methodists of our own days, implies that he is convinced that other visible religious communities have just as much right as his own in the service of Christ. Thus the essentially Christian appeal of the heretic is to a multiplicity of visible religious organizations. The only unity they can allow is that of the invisible Church, which, from the social point of view, is not a unity at all. *Only the Catholic presents his allegiance to God under the form of social unity.* This unity, *as a note of the true Church*, is possessed by the Catholic Church alone.

Among the earlier counter-Reformation theologians we find five different sets of qualities being employed as notes of the Church. Eventually one set, the four characteristics employed in the Creed of Constantinople, became the universal favorite.[14] All of these groups of notes, however, were used in exactly the same way, and with exactly the same effect. They were used then, as they should be used now, to show that the visible Catholic Church, the religious society mentioned in the Council of Constantinople, is the *ecclesia sanctorum*, the Church in which Christ abides.

The Catholic University of America, JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON.
Washington, D. C.

---

[14] St. Robert Bellarmine's influence was greatly responsible for the use of the qualities mentioned by the Creed of Constantinople as the notes of the Church. He listed fifteen properties which might serve as notes, but taught that they could be reduced to the four mentioned in the Creed.

Answers to Questions

MASS IN A FISHING CABIN

Question: Two priests wish to spend two or three week-days on a fishing trip, during which they occupy a cottage which is ten miles from the nearest church. The cottage has but one room, which must be used for both eating and sleeping. May the Bishop grant them permission to say Mass in this single room?

Answer: De juri communi (Canon 822, §4), the Bishop cannot grant permission to celebrate Mass in a room which is used for sleeping. The text of the Canon reads as follows: "Loci Ordinarius... licentiam celebrandi extra ecclesiam et oratorium super petram sacram et decenti loco, *nunquam autem in cubiculo,* concedere potest iusta tantum ac rationabili de causa, in aliquo extraordinario casu et per modum actus." (Italics ours.)

RECONSECRATION OF ALTAR STONES

Question: If an altar stone has lost its consecration because a corner has been broken off, the *sepulchrum,* with its relics, remaining intact, may either of the short forms, found in the Ritual, be used for the ceremony of reconsecration?

Answer: The Ritual (Appendix, I and II) provides for two cases in which a short form may be used for the reconsecration of an altar which has lost its consecration. The first of these is that contemplated in Canon 1200, §1, of the *Codex Juris,* which is the case of a *fixed* altar, where the stone table has been separated, if only momentarily, from the support together with which it was consecrated. The second instance is the one covered by Canon 1200, §2, 2°, where the *sepulchrum* has been tampered with. If the break in the stone has been a serious one, very likely the stone is no longer fit to be used for the celebration of Mass and so there is no question of reconsecration. If, however, the stone is still a suitable one for the purpose for which it was intended, we should think that no reconsecration is necessary, since, *in casu,* the break is not such as to involve loss of consecration, not being important *sive ratione quantitatis fractionis sive ratione loci unctionis.*(Cf. Canon 1200, §2, 1°.) The second short formula, found in the Ritual (*loc.*

cit.), despite the inclusion in the title of 1° as well as 2° of Canon 1200, §2, refers only to reconsecration made necessary by interference with the relics and their *sepulchrum* and hence does not concern the difficulty proposed by our correspondent. To conclude, therefore, we should say that either the fracture of the altar stone is a considerable one or it is not. If it is a serious one, the stone is no longer a proper subject for reconsecration. If it is not an important one, there is no need for reconsecration. The short formula, provided in the Ritual, as will be evident from a look at the ceremonial prescribed, contemplates only the case of the opening of the *sepuchrum* or the removal of the relics.

THE THREE MASSES ON CHRISTMAS DAY

Question: When a priest says the three Masses on Christmas Day in three different missions under his charge, there being no other Masses in those places, what Masses should be said? Similarly, what should be done if the first Mass and the third are in the parish church and the second in a mission church, again where these are the only Masses said in the churches concerned? Does it make a difference when High Masses are involved? Are the rulings of S.R.C. 3354 to be interpreted as personal or local?

Answer: We interpret the provisions of the decree of the Sacred Congregation, No. 3354, to be personal and not local. It provides that a priest, saying but one Mass on Christmas Day, should select the Mass which best corresponds to the time at which it is celebrated. Hence, the first Mass celebrated by a priest who is to say all three will always be that found first in the series, wherever the place and whatever the hour of its celebration. It is only when the priest says only one or two Masses that attention must be paid to the choice of the text of the Christmas Masses that he may select the Mass or Masses which best agree with the hour at which it or they are said. No change is to be made whether the Masses are Low Masses or *in cantu*. A different arrangement is provided by the Apostolic Constitution of August 10, 1915, which regulates the three Masses on All Souls' Day and directs that the celebrant should always select the first Mass as the High Mass, the faculty being his to anticipate the second and the third.

THE PAX FOR THE FIRST MASTER OF CEREMONIES

Question: In a Solemn Mass *coram Episcopo*, when there is no Assistant Priest and the Pax is carried to the presiding Bishop by the

Deacon of the Mass, from whom does the first Master of Ceremonies, stationed at the throne, receive the Pax?

Answer: When there is an Assistant Priest to the Bishop presiding at Solemn Mass, after giving the Pax to the Bishop, the Assistant Priest gives it to the Subdeacon. The latter carries it to those *in choro* and, on his return to the altar, gives it to the Deacon and then to the Master of Ceremonies, who accompanied him. This is the general provision of authorities, v.g. Martinucci (Lib. V, Cap. xiii, 177,178). Lacking an Assistant Priest, in accordance with a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (2089, 5), the Deacon of the Mass should bear the Pax from the Celebrant to the Bishop at his throne. Our deduction would be that, so far as the pax is concerned, the Deacon should follow the procedure ordinarily indicated for the Assistant Priest, giving the Pax to the Subdeacon, who would carry it to the clergy *in choro* and finally give it to the Master of Ceremonies who accompanied him. If this is not the chief Master of Ceremonies, we should have the one who accompanied the Subdeacon, after receiving the Pax from the latter, give it to the first Master of Ceremonies, then to the acolytes and any other of the minor ministers who are to receive it.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU.

THE CONFESSOR OF RELIGIOUS

Question 1: May a confessor of nuns who judges that one of the sisters in her present situation is in a proximate occasion of sin have the sister inform her superior that he *requires* the nun to be transferred to another community, or should he have her merely say that the confessor *advises* such a transfer?

Question 2: Is a superior obliged to comply with the demand or request for a transfer communicated to her by a nun as coming from her confessor?

Question 3: May a confessor of religious dispense a sister from some obligation of her rule, such as the private recitation of the Little Office, when he judges that there is a reasonable cause for such a dispensation?

Answer 1: Ordinarily, when the circumstances proposed in the question are present, the confessor should have the nun inform her superior that the confessor *advises* a change. Theoretically, he could sometimes have the transfer presented to the superior as a matter of strict obligation. However, this would not signify that he has any authority over the superior in this matter. It would simply mean that he prudently judges a transfer to another community to be the only way in the circumstances of liberating the penitent from the proximate occasion of sin, so that the law of God requires such a transfer. Nevertheless, even in an extreme case of this nature, it would be more prudent and just as effective for the confessor to have the nun communicate the message to her superior as a recommendation rather than as an obligation. Needless to say, the sister would not have to explain about the reason for the suggested change any more than that it is for her spiritual welfare.

Answer 2: A religious superior, informed by one of the nuns that her confessor advises or commands a transfer, should ordinarily comply with the request or demand, without asking any questions as to the particular reason for such action on the part of the confessor. It should suffice for her to be informed by the sister that the confessor regards such a change as conducive to her spiritual welfare. This course of action might provide an occasion of deception on the part of a nun who is seeking a transfer to another community, but the spiritual benefits at stake in general sufficiently compensate for the abuses which could occur occasionally. We say that this should be the ordinary rule, for at times a superior may have enough reason to believe that the nun is a victim of hallucination or is guilty of deception to refrain from making the transfer. In the event that a nun cannot persuade her superior that the confessor actually suggested or required a transfer, she could give the confessor permission to communicate the message to the superior directly. However, this is an extreme measure, which should be used only as a last resort.

Answer 3: The confessor as such has no authority to dispense from the religious rules of his penitents. The Code explicitly prescribes: "The confessors of religious women, both ordinary and extraordinary, shall in no way meddle with the internal or external government of the community" (Canon 524, §3). At times a confessor can prudently judge that a nun is *excused* from the observance of some rule, so that no dispensation is needed; but even in such an event, he should ordinarily tell her to present the matter to the superior, so that she may declare that an excusing cause is present.

THE EUCHARISTIC FAST

Question: When a sick person, by virtue of Canon 858, §2, is permitted to receive Holy Communion after taking some liquid nourishment, may he take a lozenge or a piece of hard candy, considering it it as liquid nourishment, since it is dissolved in the mouth before being swallowed?

Answer: The distinction between solid and liquid nourishment is based on the nature of the substance before it is taken into the mouth. Hence, a lozenge or a piece of hard candy must be regarded as a solid; the fact that it is dissolved in the mouth before being swallowed does not put it in the category of liquids. However, it should be remembered that by virtue of Canon 858, §2, a sick person entitled to the exemption from the eucharistic fast there mentioned may take even a solid substance *as medicine*. Accordingly, if in a particular case a lozenge or a piece of hard candy is reasonably called for as a medicine —for example, to relieve a cough or to soothe the throat—the sick person need not hesitate to make use of it.

LIP-STICK AS A THEOLOGICAL PROBLEM

Question 1: Is there any reason to fear that lip-stick will break the eucharistic fast?

Question 2: If the lips of a woman who is receiving Extreme Unction are coated with lip-stick, is there any danger that the anointing of the mouth will not be valid?

Answer 1: The danger of breaking the eucharistic fast to which the question refers might seem to some to be present if a portion of the paste which women use for reddening their lips is dissolved by the tongue and swallowed. However, according to the interpretation of theologians, this would not break the fast, since it would be consumed *per modum salivae* (Aertnys-Damen, *Theologia Moralis* [Turin, 1939], Vol. II, n. 156). Accordingly, it is not conformable with theological teaching to warn women against the use of lip-stick before receiving Holy Communion on the ground that they are likely to break their fast.

Answer 2: If there is a thick coating of lip-stick on the lips, there would be grave danger that the anointing of the mouth performed on the lips would not be valid; and in that event the validity of the sacrament would be doubtful. If a priest encounters a case of this kind, the practical solution would be to anoint on the skin above or below the lips, not colored by the lip-stick. This would eliminate all danger of an invalid anointing.

Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

Book Reviews

THE ASCETICAL LIFE. By Pascal P. Parente, S.T.D., Ph.D., J.C.B. St. Louis and London, B. Herder Book Co., 1944. Pp. viii + 271. $2.50.

Father Parente, Professor of Ascetical and Mystical Theology at The Catholic University of America, has been prevailed upon to publish his lectures on Ascetics. The need of scientific works on the ascetical life in English is urgent, because good will and desire can not substitute for knowledge. We have had to rely on standard works of another age which were often unattractive in arrangement or style or which emphasized only a few phases of asceticism. This book is comprehensive without being discouraging in length or laboriously exhaustive in treatment. Too often spiritual life has been aimless or unproductive because souls had no idea of progress in supernatural living and confessors were not familiar enough with the stages of growth leading to perfection. Therefore the book is highly recommended to priests, especially those engaged in the direction of religious, to all seminarians, and to religious communities.

The book is divided into three parts: General Ascetics, Special Ascetics, and Amplification of Special Questions. The first part follows the traditional divisions of definition, methods, importance. It treats Christian life, the nature of perfection, the obligation of perfection and the common means. The second part takes up the traditional degrees of spiritual life with added chapters on the gifts of the Holy Ghost, discernment of spirits, scruples and direction. The third part deals more fully with certain questions such as the meaning of asceticism, the love of God, universality of the obligation to tend to perfection, the state of perfection, asceticism and mysticism, and a fine closing chapter on the ascetical value of retreats.

There are many valuable developments. Noteworthy are the warning to combine the speculative and the descriptive methods in this science (p. 11), the indispensability of knowledge (p. 12), the balanced judgment on the controversy about acquired and infused contemplation, the objectives of mortification and the value of much-neglected passive mortification (pp. 95 ff.), a fine treatment of temptation (p. 100), the value of spiritual reading and its relation to prayer (p. 221), a necessary and convincing treatment of the universality of the obligation to strive for perfection (p. 199), the state of perfection, particularly with regard to priests (p. 211). Especially stimulating and instructive in the development is the abundant use of the Fathers.

The work might be improved by a discussion of spiritual discouragement, a common ailment, and not to be identified with tepidity. It seems too that the ant-asceticism of our age, which has infected views on the spiritual life, should be called to the attention of modern students of spirituality. The summary of the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius is not quite accurate (pp. 247 f.). These are minor points which do not at all mar the value of the present work. The treatise is rounded out with an adequate bibliography and a helpful index. One looks forward to the publication of the lectures of Fr. Parente on Mystical Theology.

EDWARD L. MURPHY, S.J.

POLAND AND RUSSIA: THE LAST QUARTER CENTURY. By Ann Su Cardwell. New York, Sheed & Ward, 1944. Pp. xii + 251. $2.75.

The story of events occurring within the space of the last twenty-five years can, naturally, be no more than chronicle, since all the documents relative to these events are not available in full and one must base one's opinions on news reports and the personal experiences of oneself or of others, none of which gives the complete understanding necessary to write a dispassionate history of the period. The matter becomes all the more difficult when the atmosphere in which one lives is as surcharged with prejudices as it is in the case of Soviet Russia. With so many praising that country as the zenith of political, social and economic perfection while as many or more condemn it as the nadir of all human aspirations one finds it difficult to attain that detachment in considering its policies which is essential if one would take one's stand intelligently in regard to it.

The author of this book, having lived for seventeen years in Poland where she became much attached to the country and its people and having traveled for a month in the Soviet Union, will, consequently, be accused by some of seeing the question of the relations between Poland and Russia only through Polish eyes, especially as regards the frontier between the two states, a frontier fixed between Poland and Russia by the Treaty of Riga (1921), but subsequently rearranged by the Soviet-German Treaty (1941).

There are many harrowing episodes recounted in the book concerning the deportation of people from Eastern Poland, the stripping of that part of the country, the difficulties of the Poles in Russia who wished to form an army there and fight the Germans. The book is not concerned with relations between Poland and Germany; consequently, what was done in the part of the country occupied by the Germans is not mentioned, but that boundary is not in dispute.

The reader may or may not agree with the author's opinions on the relations between Poland and Soviet Russia—he may even be greatly annoyed by the book,—but he must at the same time be thankful that Mrs. Cardwell has presented this side of the picture, for, if this side is not presented as well as the Russian, the reader cannot have grounds on which to make up his mind in regard to this question.

If we do not praise the book more warmly, since it is chronicle, we do not condemn it, for that would be an admission that the average reader is not capable of thinking things out in regard to foreign relations and that secret diplomacy is the only method for relations between states.

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN.

WESTERN CIVILIZATION. THE DECLINE OF ROME TO 1660. By Francis J. Tschan, Harold J. Grimm and J. Duane Squires. Edited by Walter Consuelo Langsam. Chicago, Philadelphia, and New York, J. B. Lippincott Co., 1942. Pp. 743 + xciii.

Although there is no dearth of college text books dealing with the ancient, medieval and Renaissance periods of history, the present volume deserves more than ordinary commendation. The tone of the book, in general, is sympathetic to Catholic thought, doctrine and tradition. Even such easily controversial subjects as Wiclifism, Lutheranism, Anglicanism, etc., are treated objectively and respectfully.

Only occasionally does one run into a repetition of some all-too-frequently reiterated objectionable statements or phrases. For example, the author on p. 491 speaks of "the sale of indulgences." Indulgences are not and never were "sold." A *free contribution*, e.g. for the erection of some new cathedral, church, or shrine was *requested* on the occasion of the granting of an indulgence, but none, especially not the poor, were ever deprived of the spiritual benefits of the Church because of poverty. Neither is it exactly true that Huss was "cited to appear at the Council of Constance to give an account of his doctrines" (p. 491). Huss, like Luther, *appealed* to a General Council. The assertion that "the cardinals, in violation of the safe conduct, threw him into a dungeon before the arrival of Sigismund" also requires clarification. The letters of safe conduct given Huss by King Sigismund referred only to his passage *from* Prague *to* Constance; not to his presence in Constance, nor to his safe return to Prague where he might defiantly continue his harangues against the Church and the papacy. The whole General Council, to which Huss had appealed, would thus have been deprived of its sanctioning power. In fact, before finally deciding to go to Constance Huss had declared: "If I am found guilty of error or heresy, I am ready to submit to death as a disseminator of error and of heresy."

On his arrival at Constance Huss was not thrown into a "dungeon." Dr. (later Bishop) Thomas J. Shahan, in his article on the "Council of Constance" in *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (IV, 291 f.) states that Huss and his protectors during the entourage—three Bohemian noblemen—entered Constance on Nov. 3, 1414, where Huss first took up his residence in a private house. The Western Schism was just then in progress and John XXIII, the Pisan Pope, was naturally anxious to gain the favor of Sigismund, the recognized future emperor, and Huss's friend. Accordingly, as also from a sense of justice towards an accused criminal before trial, and in the interest of a free and unbiased hearing, the Pope "treated him courteously" and even "removed the censures of excommunication and interdict" (*ibid.*) levied against Huss by the Archbishop of Prague and by Papal Bull. John XXIII did, however, forbid Huss to read Mass or to preach, for Huss's heretical doctrines concerning the invisible Church, the norm of Faith, and indulgences, his vile denunciation of clergy and Papacy, and his advocacy of Communion for the laity under both species, were well known and had already stirred up the public in Prague and throughout Bohemia. There would hardly have been reason for this solemn prohibition to read Mass or to preach publicly, had Huss been thrown into a "dungeon" immediately after his arrival in Constance. It was only after he had flagrantly violated the papal prohibition that he was ordered arrested by the Bishop of Constance (not by the cardinals) and a little later, Dec. 6, a whole month after his arrival in Constance, placed in a Dominican convent, which despite the medieval *carceres* in monasteries and friaries, could hardly be styled a "dungeon." On his own request Huss was later transferred to the castle of Gottlieben, and still later (June, 1415), to the Franciscan convent at Constance. He thus had four respectable habitations while at Constance.

When King Sigismund heard that Huss had violated the Pope's orders, although in the beginning somewhat irate over his friend's imprisonment, he acquiesced to the arrest and declared (Jan. 1, 1415) that he would not prevent the council from dealing according to law with persons accused of heresy. When Huss obstinately refused to recant, he was condemned to death, the medieval Church *and State* penalty for heresy (July 6, 1415).

Aside from these few objectionable points, the book is highly commendable. The format nears the apex of perfection: the easily legible type, the marginal captions, the serviceable maps, and the classical illustrations,—all tend to enhance its value. There is a rich bibliography of thirty-nine pages for suggested reading; a reference table of Popes and rulers, and an excellent index. Although accentuating primarily the secular and economic phases of medieval and Renaissance history, the book can also be profitably used as a background for Church history. The authors have, in the main, done a difficult job well.

RAPHAEL M. HUBER, O.F.M.CONV.